



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2022

No. 101

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 14, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TONY CÁRDENAS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 10, 2022, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF RUTH ELLIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. TLAIB) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, during Pride Month, to honor the phenomenal Ruth Ellis, a former Detroit resident who was the oldest surviving open lesbian and an LGBTQ rights activist.

Born in 1899, and living until the age of 101, she came out as a lesbian around 1915. She took in LGBTQ-plus youth experiencing homelessness and dis-

placement, and her home became known as “the gay spot.”

Not only did she give refuge to our youth, but she provided them books, food, and even assistance with their college tuition. She was an icon.

Still today, LGBTQ-plus youth experience homelessness at a disproportionate rate. The Ruth Ellis Center in Highland Park was created in the 13 District Strong and was named after and in honor of Ms. Ellis. They provide safe, affordable, identity-affirming housing for marginalized Black and Brown Detroiters, especially our LGBTQ-plus youth. Join me today in honoring and recognizing Ruth Ellis and the incredible advocacy of the Ruth Ellis Center and their incredible team.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF GREG MUDGE

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, today, I celebrate the memory of Greg Mudge, a longtime community advocate and businessowner in Detroit, who we tragically lost last year. Greg was a beloved member of our community, and his sudden death was a shock to us all.

When he first opened Mudgie’s Deli back in 2008, Greg was already considered a member of our community. A food service veteran himself, he built and managed his own business with the heart and soul of family. His approach was “all hands on deck,” and he never shied away from any task and was always ready to give a helping hand.

Greg’s commitment to serving homemade food, including incorporating family recipes, made Mudgie’s Deli a neighborhood standout. More than that, Greg’s enthusiasm and passion for his work shined through in all that he did. Greg Mudge embodied the spirit of our beautiful southwest Detroit community and our Corktown neighborhood. Please join me in honoring his memory.

REFORM THE MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, Democrats keep forcing taxpayers to bail out failing and mismanaged union-run multiemployer pension plans, and it needs to stop.

The Committee on Education and Labor has dedicated considerable time and held countless hearings on the problems posed by multiemployer pension plans and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation’s, PBGC’s, multiemployer insurance program.

Unfortunately, unlike previous bipartisan legislation to address the failing system, our Democrat colleagues decided to go it alone by enacting the deceitful American Rescue Plan Act, ARPA.

Under the guise of COVID relief, ARPA included an irresponsible and uncapped taxpayer bailout of failing and insolvent multiemployer pension plans. Let me repeat, there is no cap on the amount of taxpayer dollars that PBGC may send to multiemployer plans.

This is especially concerning given that multiemployer plans are currently underfunded by \$756 billion.

Unsurprisingly, the cost of ARPA’s pension bailout program continues to grow. The Congressional Budget Office originally estimated it would cost taxpayers \$86 billion. Five months later, PBGC estimated it would likely distribute \$94.2 billion. After 2 more months, PBGC estimated it would likely distribute \$97.2 billion and, in one scenario, could distribute upward of \$147 billion.

To date, PBGC has disbursed \$6.7 billion to 26 plans, and this is just the beginning.

In April, the Central States, South-east and Southwest Areas Pension Plan

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5489

requested a staggering \$35 billion from taxpayers. PBGC is reviewing an additional eight applications requesting a total of \$1.1 billion. In all, PBGC is expected to send money to over 250 pension plans.

PBGC has confirmed what we knew to be true, but others refused to admit: ARPA's taxpayer-funded bailout will not fix a thing.

In September, the agency stated the massive influx of taxpayer dollars will only delay the immediate insolvency of the multiemployer insurance program, and insolvency is still likely. Simply throwing money at plans will not solve the problem.

ARPA failed to address the underlying structural issues in the multiemployer system that contributed to the crisis, thus ensuring that plan mismanagement and underfunding will persist. In fact, ARPA includes a galling provision that explicitly bars PBGC from reforming plan governance or altering plan-funding rules of plans receiving a bailout.

It is clear to me that the mismanagement of multiemployer plans and the risks they pose to workers, retirees, and the taxpayer cannot be ignored. Congress must require multiemployer plans to measure their liabilities accurately and collect adequate contributions to fund benefits.

Failing and insolvent plans must stop making promises that they are unable and unwilling to keep. It is common practice for insolvent plans, which do not have enough funds to pay current retirees, to continue allowing active participants to accrue benefits and enroll new workers into the plan. This is deceptive. This is wrong. This must stop.

Congress should increase multiemployer insurance premiums to account for the risk that underfunded plans pose to PBGC.

Multiemployer plans pay a meager flat-rate premium of \$31 per participant. In contrast, the single-employer program requires plans to pay an \$88 flat-rate premium in addition to a variable rate premium based on a plan's level of underfunding.

Decades of chronic underfunding and false promises have put millions of workers and retirees at risk. By proping up this clearly unsustainable system without enacting reforms, ARPA continues to enable and encourage the irresponsible behaviors that caused this crisis.

Taxpayers saving for their own retirements should not be on the hook to pay for the broken promises of union-run multiemployer pension plans.

There must be accountability for this gross mismanagement and real reform to ensure the multiemployer pension system does not continue to deceive workers and the American people.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ELTON DEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of Montgomery County Commissioner Elton Dean, who passed away at the age of 72 on June 7, 2022.

A native of Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, Chairman Dean graduated from Montgomery's own George Washington Carver High School before attending Selma University, where he received his associate's degree.

Returning to Montgomery, Chairman Dean pursued his bachelor of science at the Alabama State University, where he graduated in 1971 with a degree in business and economics.

Chairman Dean went on to become a successful businessman, putting to work his entrepreneurial spirit to serve and improve his community as owner of Dean Realty as well as 21st Century Hair Studio.

In November 2000, Chairman Dean was first elected to the Montgomery County Commission, where he humbly and faithfully served the Second District for over 20 years. Dean was elected vice chairman in November 2004 before making history in March 2009 as the first African American to serve as chair of the Montgomery County Commission. Montgomery County includes the historic city of Montgomery, Alabama.

Known as a dedicated public servant and passionate community leader, Chairman Dean's legacy lives on in the countless projects and initiatives that came into fruition under his leadership, including the implementation of Montgomery County's back-to-school sales tax holiday.

Chairman Dean is also known for bringing the commission meetings to the people by holding his "On the Road" initiative, which allowed constituents to meet directly with their representatives.

Chairman Dean worked tirelessly to improve Montgomery County's economic well-being. Among his most notable achievements, he oversaw the implementation of the 1 percent sales tax in 2001, which generated over \$428 million for public education in Montgomery County, delivering critically needed resources to the children of our community.

Chairman Dean never missed an opportunity to give back. Throughout his adult life, he held countless positions, including serving on boards and organizations throughout Montgomery County, which included as executive board member of the South Central Alabama Boys and Girls Club as well as board member for the Montgomery Improvement Association, board member for the Central Alabama Community Foundation, and chairman of the trustee board and mass choir member of Mt. Zion African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. He was commissioner of the Central Alabama Amateur Baseball League and commissioner of the Southern League Dixie Youth Baseball.

A very strong advocate for his alma mater, Chairman Dean returned to the

Alabama State University later in life to serve as chairman of the board of trustees for the Alabama State University. In this role, he served for 9 years and generated \$525 million worth of campus improvement.

In his role as chairman of the board of trustees for Alabama State University, I got to know Chairman Dean because he gave me, as a young bond lawyer, the opportunity to represent my parents' alma mater, the Alabama State University.

It was Chairman Dean who encouraged me to run for Congress, and for his mentorship and his friendship, I am forever grateful.

Chairman Dean rightfully received numerous awards throughout the community: the Pioneer Award by The Montgomery Tuskegee Times; the Montgomery County Area Chamber of Commerce Chairman's Award in 2012; the Citizen of the Year Award by the Sigma Phi Chapter of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity in 2004; the Citizen of the Year Award by Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Montgomery's Alumni Chapter; as well as the Kershaw YMCA Man of the Year.

Chairman Dean was a true public servant and a servant leader. Though I know so many of us are heartbroken by his passing, I am eternally grateful for our partnership on behalf of the citizens of Montgomery County, Alabama, and blessed to have been guided by his mentorship as well as his friendship over the years.

May his family find comfort in knowing that Elton Dean's legacy will live on in the hearts of all those he impacted. As we mourn his passing, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the extraordinary life and legacy of Montgomery County Commission Chairman Elton Dean.

□ 1015

RUNAWAY DEFICIT SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, inflation is at the highest level we have seen since Jimmy Carter was in the White House.

I have spoken many times about rising prices being fueled by out-of-control spending. Today, I rise with even more proof that this has been the case.

President Biden's 2021 COVID stimulus bill overheated the economy, just as I, and many other Republican Members of Congress, along with numerous economists from both sides of the political divide, predicted.

Now a report by the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office shows that spending did, in fact, create a worker shortage which strained supply chains and contributed to the economic crisis in which we find ourselves today.

One year ago, companies across middle Tennessee were struggling to find workers. More than 160,000 Tennesseans were unemployed; yet 218,000 jobs were

available. Folks were earning \$15.75 an hour to stay home because of the unnecessary \$2 trillion bill pushed through by congressional Democrats on a party line vote.

Employers became desperate. Many were forced to offer massive sign-on bonuses and other incentives just to find enough workers to continue operating as normal. Unfortunately, some had to close their doors.

Tennessee's Governor Bill Lee, a businessowner himself, recognized the damage enhanced Federal unemployment benefits were causing on restaurants and retail stores. He noticed many couldn't compete with \$300 a week from the Federal Government on top of State unemployment benefits.

Fortunately, he put a stop to the flow of Federal unemployment dollars in Tennessee, and he was right. At last check, there were about 13,000 unemployment claims in Tennessee, compared to roughly 60,000 claims this time last year.

Still, the cost of living has increased every month under the Biden administration, and the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office projects it will continue to impact Americans at least into 2023.

This is what happens when you do what is politically expedient. This is the direct result of runaway deficit spending.

The Federal Reserve is now having to be the adult in the room and raise interest rates to lower inflation. Raising interest rates is a harsh step, but one made necessary by the Biden administration's reckless handling of the economy.

It will make it harder and more expensive to borrow money for your first home or to buy a new car. Raising interest rates will also cause our economy to slow down. This means people will lose their jobs, their savings, and in many cases, even their small businesses.

Our economy already got 1.5 percent smaller in the first quarter of the year. It is why many economists are predicting a recession or worse in the next 12 months.

It didn't have to be this way. The President and congressional Democrats didn't have to borrow and spend so much money. This administration inherited one of the strongest economies in my life. It took fewer than 2 years for them to completely destroy it. President Biden must do better.

UNIVERSAL MEAL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, when the pandemic closed schools and left millions of children without meals they needed, our government took action. Emergency waivers eliminated income caps and gave meal providers flexibility in delivering food.

Even now, with schools reopened, these waivers are getting healthy

meals to children without burying families under mountains of paperwork, but these provisions are set to expire on June 30.

As 97 percent of meal providers like schools struggle to pay soaring food prices, these protections should be strengthened, not stopped.

This year, California became the first State to provide free meals to any student. Offering no-cost meals to everyone, regardless of income, helps resources reach the kids who need them most.

This will also help California's kids in schools perform better. Free meals contribute to better attendance, fewer nurse visits, and higher test scores. California's universal meal program will benefit schools and families. The Nation should follow our example.

TAKING ACTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the greater our delay in taking action on climate change, the higher the price tag will be for families and our economy.

Last week, Californians suffered through an intense heat wave. Temperatures went over 100 degrees in parts of our State. That is bad for public health and bad for our economy.

A study by the Atlantic Council estimates that the total economic loss from excessive heat is at least \$100 billion annually. They also estimate that this loss could double by 2030 and quintuple by 2050 if we don't take climate action.

Simply put, the fiscally responsible thing to do is for Congress to act quickly to prevent further losses. Taking climate action will lower and stabilize costs for families.

High temperatures aren't just bad for human health. They are bad for our economy. Heat waves push prices for electricity higher, costing us billions. We should not leave families in California and across the country to figure out their budgets while Washington figures out climate change.

The need for climate change is urgent, not just for our planet, but also for our pocketbooks.

PTSD AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is failing people with post-traumatic stress disorder. During June, PTSD Awareness Month, we must commit to doing better.

Mental health affects many across our Nation, but I rise today to shine light on the brave young people dealing with PTSD.

Too many Americans, including many with PTSD, go without the mental healthcare they need because their insurance won't cover it. I wrote a bill, which is now Federal law, to crack down on insurance companies that break the rules and refuse to cover mental health the same way they cover physical health. I am proud the House is considering additional proposals I have worked on to strengthen the enforcement of protections for mental health coverage.

When a child experiences a traumatic event, like emotional or sexual abuse, it harms their emotional, social, and cognitive development. These adverse childhood experiences are linked to substance use disorder, chronic health issues, and PTSD.

We cannot let trauma or related challenges hold students back from getting high quality educations. The effect of these experiences doesn't end when children leave their homes for college. They bleed into their daily lives, including in the classroom.

I am proud to introduce legislation, the Student Mental Health Rights Act, which would direct the Department of Education to study mental health, issue guidance to help schools level the playing field, and support students in overcoming their mental health challenges so they can complete their schooling. Our students need this help.

For Americans with PTSD of all ages, awareness is not enough. They need action.

RETURNING TO FISCAL SANITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the chilling state of the American economy. The stock market is tanking. The American people know what a disaster President Biden and the majority's economic policies have been, and they are acting accordingly and expressing the lowest consumer confidence in a record 50 years of data.

Pumping trillions in spending through this body, including the so-called American Rescue Plan, has, in large part, caused a 40-year high in inflation as the CPI rose to 8.6 percent in May.

The Nation is \$30 trillion in debt, and the CBO predicts \$1.6 trillion in deficits over the next decade. The Federal Reserve will be forced to continue to raise interest rates, further exacerbating the beleaguered economy.

Gas prices are at \$5 a gallon, due to the President's assaults on American oil drilling and fracking and domestic energy exploration, and the Green New Deal priorities of the majority and this administration are exacerbating the energy crisis.

As The Wall Street Journal recently asked: Has anyone, other than unsuccessful green energy subsidy firms, benefited from the Biden economy?

What is more, the President's \$5.8 trillion tax-and-spend budget is fiscally irresponsible. Biden's budget cuts \$428 million in Customs and Border Protection's budget in the midst of a border crisis.

It skyrockets Federal spending by a third, compared to prepandemic levels, calls for \$2.5 trillion in tax hikes, and sets this country on a course of extended fiscal doom at a time when we are currently on the precipice of a recession.

The American economy cannot sustain a Federal Government that is

vacuuming tax dollars out of the pockets of the private sector at a record pace.

Still, today, the majority will not even propose a budget, much less one that achieves balance, and instead, funds the government and inflates the currency through massive omnibus bills and continuing resolutions.

We need to return to regular order in this House and return to fiscal sanity to rescue this economy from a recession that looms large in what is likely to be a long, hot summer for millions of American families.

OUR ECONOMY IS BOOMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the record-breaking number of jobs created under President Biden's watch, his plan to lower costs for hard-working American families, and our plan to continue building a better America.

Since President Biden took office, the economy has added 8.7 million new jobs—8.7 million new jobs. That is staggering. Fun fact, Mr. Speaker, this is the most jobs added in any President's first 16 months. I repeat: The most jobs added in any President's first 16 months. This is historic.

The fact that the economy is booming is no accident. You see, President Biden laid the foundation for an amazing recovery through his American Rescue Plan and vaccination program. This plan got people back to work, kids back in schools, and helped the American economy bounce back.

Together, with President Biden, House Democrats are not only bringing back jobs, but we are growing paychecks for households across the country. Because of this, unemployment is near historic lows, and even better, the number of Americans relying on unemployment benefits has dropped by more than 90 percent. This is huge.

In short, our Nation has recovered 96 percent of the jobs lost during the pandemic and is on track to return to prepandemic employment levels before the end of the year.

Mr. Speaker, this is a direct result of President Biden's leadership, Congress' partnership, and the backing of the American people.

While many Americans are back at work, we have heard calls from hard-working families struggling with the cost of inflation. Sadly, Putin's war against Ukraine is now the biggest single driver of inflation, but we have a plan for this too.

I am proud to report that House Democrats and President Biden are acting to lower gas prices by fighting Putin's price hike. The United States is on track to produce a record amount of oil next year, and coming from Texas, that is music to our ears, and the President is working with the industry to accelerate this output.

Democrats are also laser focused on lowering everyday costs for families at the grocery store, and they are also improving the supply chain. We are fighting for everyday Americans by reducing the cost of everyday goods through the COMPETES Act.

This landmark legislation will lower costs and strengthen our supply chains by making more products right here in America: Made in USA. Again, this will create more jobs.

We also have great news on the Federal deficit. Biden is still on track to drop the budget deficit by \$1.6 trillion this year alone.

Mr. Speaker, another fun fact, President Biden has cut the deficit more this year than any President in history. I repeat, more than any President in history. In contrast, Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration increased the Federal budget deficit every single year they were in office.

All things considered, President Biden and House Democrats are not only working together to continue building a better America for all Americans, but we are delivering on that promise, and we will continue to do just that—delivering on our promise.

□ 1030

PUTTING AMERICANS LAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as the 4-day tour occurs inside the Capitol on January 6, where a loaded, biased committee attempts to parse the words of the President on the day, we have many other crises to deal with in this country that are directly affecting and harming the American people, their ability to do their basic day-to-day operation of their homes, get to their jobs, get their kids to school.

So what are we doing? What are we doing? Chasing January 6. Look at our border right now, where under the current Biden policies, we are attracting the largest caravan ever of illegal aliens heading toward our border. The idea that we are going to get rid of title 42 or just the general porosity of the border anyway. It has been a giant magnet ever since January 20, 2021, when this President came in and started shredding our border policy.

We had success under President Trump, where we had the best control of the border we had in quite a while, with approximately 450 additional miles of rebuilt or new fence that was very effective in those zones.

So what do we have now? We have warehouses and stacks and pallets of fence material, millions of dollars' worth of it, lying about on our southern border being stored instead of installed.

We heard some chatter here a couple months ago from the Biden administration, well, maybe we should just go

ahead and put up those additional pieces there where there are some obvious gaps.

I had a chance to visit Yuma, Arizona a few weeks ago. It was pretty incredible because there would be miles of fence, but there would be these gaps occasionally, and that is where people would pour through illegally. Amazing.

We could rectify that by just filling a lot of the gaps, thereby making our Customs and Border Patrol job much easier by being able to focus on fewer areas instead of wide-open spaces or gaps all along our border.

But, no, it seems to be about some other agenda. 15,000 people possibly will crowd the border here soon under the idea that we are going to possibly let title 42 go. Thankfully, two different courts have stopped that.

So what are we doing? The terrorists come across our border really almost unchecked. They capture a handful of them, but how many are getting by that get away? We don't know that. Are they starting cells right here in our country? Why not?

As we know, in April, there were over 230,000 encounters, they call them, at the southern border. That is the highest in U.S. history for one month. Why is this? Because we have a giant magnet, again, turned on by this administration saying, come on across. You only need to have a sliver of an excuse for asylum.

The asylum law needs to be changed if that is how they are going to enforce it because it has to be for a true threat. You also have to seek asylum in the country closest to you, if you are an asylum seeker and that is what you are really after, but one closest to you, not pick and choose what country you are going to move up to, basically the United States with all the benefits it hands out.

According to polling, when you ask the American people, who are worried about gas and groceries or whether another load of formula is going to come in from Europe on a military transport in time for their small children to be able to have the type of food that they are accustomed to, the majority of Americans disapprove of the Biden administration's operation of our borders, especially the elimination of title 42, which is a health risk issue.

When you talk about the issue of formula, we are putting Americans last, when the Biden administration prioritized shipments of pallets of baby formula to the border holding stations instead of across the fruited plain. It is pretty pathetic. Indeed, it was this administration whose FDA stepped in on the major producer of formula and said: We are going to shut you down because we had a couple of incidents that have been reported.

So what happens? The FDA didn't call back when the company that is the major producer of formula asks, What is it we need to do to be in compliance in your eyes? The administration knew about this, yet they prioritized what

formula was available to go down to the border stations there. Thankfully, recently, we passed legislation so that we could release more supplies to have them be eligible for those who are on assistance.

As we see the disaster on the border, I don't see a single remedy even being talked about by the Biden administration. They don't really care about the American people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, on this Flag Day, when we pause to acknowledge the symbol of liberty and democracy to which we pledge our allegiance, remind us of the significance of Your authority over this land of the free and the brave and the faithfulness to which we are called to give to You.

In this season when we celebrate with cookouts and patriotic festivities, when we stand and salute the national ensign held with great honor in the hands of scouts and veterans, may we pause first in homage to the author of our freedoms in whose hands our lives are held.

And as we consider the multitude of times this emblem of our country has draped the caskets of men and women who have worn the cloth of our Nation, having sacrificed their comforts, their security, their very lives in its defense, may we find strength in the covering of the peace You keep over our land and the solace You provide all those who grieve.

Almighty God, long may our flag wave under the banner of love You hold over us.

In Your sovereign name we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) come for-

ward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

TAKING ACTION TO END GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, 1 month ago today, my community of Buffalo was targeted by a racist mass shooter. The lasting toll and trauma of gun violence is evident and perhaps most compelling through the words of Buffalo students in Ms. O'Rourke's class.

Taniya wrote, "I want to be able to go to school and earn my education without the fear of possibly not making it back home because of the color of my skin."

NasZair describes feeling vulnerable because he is Black and worries, "Will my family be safe when we go to the supermarkets?"

Journey says, "I am 13 years old. It is unfair for a middle schooler to regularly think about these things." She asks, "What will you do and the government do to stop these attacks?"

Brianna pleads, "I want someone to do something. I want the government to do their job. Too many mass shootings happened in such a small amount of time."

For students and families in Buffalo and other communities forever changed by mass shootings, now is the time for Congress to do its job and take action to end gun violence.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1173

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE: Ms. Davids of Kansas.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS: Mr. Peters.
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE: Mrs. Cherfilus-McCormick.

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DINGELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTION FOR SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, after three unanimous consent requests of mine that were blocked, Congress will finally vote to provide Supreme Court Justices and their families with more security.

I am glad this bill is coming to the floor as is. The Senate passed it unanimously, 100-0, more than a month ago. Madam Speaker, the House Democrats have delayed it for more than a month.

The question the American public asks is why? Why would you delay it?

We have all known that additional security has been necessary since the Dobbs opinion was leaked last month. Justice Kavanaugh was targeted by an armed and dangerous man who flew clear across the country to kill him. He had zip ties. He had a plan.

Far-left groups have plans to target Justice Amy Coney Barrett and her children. They put out where their children go to school. But Congress kept it here for a month—for a month. These unnecessary delays put the safety of the Justices and their families in danger.

By passing the bill as is, we are sending a clear message to the leftwing radicals: You cannot intimidate the Supreme Court Justices. I hope we all take that message to heart.

How can we forget what Senator SCHUMER said? He didn't just say it—he screamed it—on the steps of the Supreme Court. "You will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions."

I don't know what he meant by, "You will pay the price," because the Supreme Court Justices aren't up for an election. It couldn't be that they would lose at the polls. They are lifetime appointments.

Now, I don't know if that young man who came all the way from California to kill a Justice, if that is what he thought SCHUMER was saying, but what was he saying, "You will pay the price"?

I hope Senator SCHUMER understands that his words have consequences. I believe he should apologize for contributing to this heated climate.

With that said, again, I am glad this bill is finally coming to the floor. It should not have been this hard or taken this long. Every single person in the Senate voted for it: Republican, Democrat, Independent. It sat here for a whole month. Even though we came

to the floor and asked for unanimous consent to bring it forward, we were denied.

It should not have taken a threat against Justice Kavanaugh to force action, a threat that even Speaker PELOSI dismissed in her press conference. She said, "Everybody will be fine."

But at the end of the day, this is the better bill, and I am glad it will be heading to the President's desk without any poison pills to ping it back to the Senate, to delay it further. This is a big victory.

Now, let's work to defend our justice system for everyone by upholding the rule of law which is under attack daily in our cities. We can't uphold the rule of law when there is looting, when cities and police stations are being burned down, when criminals are coddled instead of locked up.

Now that this Congress has come together to condemn intimidation against Supreme Court Justices, let's take the next step to keep America safe. Let's support our police, not defund them. Let's enforce all the laws on the books like the law that prohibits protesting outside Justices' homes. Even President Biden encouraged people to do that.

Let's get tough on crime so that every American can feel safe in their homes and in their communities. Just in my home State, back in the home city of our Speaker, San Francisco, the people had a big voice. They have just recalled their district attorney because of crime.

It is not for me to give any political advice to the other side of the aisle, but if you want to know what the Republican registration in San Francisco is, it is 6.8 percent. I think your message of defunding the police by this majority party, and I think your message of not upholding the law, the American public doesn't want that.

They want to feel safe, just as a Supreme Court Justice does. They want to be able to go to their jobs and not feel they are being intimidated.

Let's get tough on crime. We want the American public to feel safe in their homes and their communities. They want to feel safe. Those are the things that would create a safer, stronger America, just like we had before.

I will make this one promise. If Democrats don't do it during this Congress, I promise you we will in the next Congress, because there is definitely going to be a change.

SERGEANTS MAJOR ACADEMY 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. ESCOBAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the founding of the United States Sergeants Major Academy.

Fort Bliss is the home to the Sergeants Major Academy that trains our

military leaders to address our country's challenges. Since 1972, the academy has expanded students' strategic level of thinking to become capable to address large-scale combat operations.

At the end of the academy, leaders leave as agile, adaptive senior leaders with the character, competence, and commitment to be effective leaders.

I am proud that my office's veterans' caseworker, Sergeant Major Benito Torres, graduated from the academy in 2009.

I commend the continuous education that the academy provides and their dedication for our military to be ready for future challenges. Please join me in recognizing the accomplishments of the last 50 years of the United States Sergeants Major Academy and wish them continued growth and success.

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL SHOOTING ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Five years ago today, the Republican baseball team took to the field for their regular morning practice. That morning took a dark turn when the team suddenly became a target of a BERNIE SANDERS' supporter with an agenda to shoot and kill Republicans.

It could have been the worst political massacre in American history, but we are alive today, thanks to those brave and honorable law enforcement officers who were at the field that day and willing to sacrifice themselves to protect us.

Every day, I wear this wristband stamped with the date of the shooting and the words, "In God We Trust" to remember the angels watching over us on that life-changing morning. It is a testament to that day, always living in our hearts and our minds.

There is no doubt that without quick action of Special Agents Griner and Bailey, along with the Alexandria Police Department, the team would not be here today. We forever owe a debt of gratitude to our law enforcement and our first responders who acted swiftly to take down the gunman and simply save our lives.

In God We Trust.

□ 1215

HONORING THE LIFE OF SHERIFF JOHN O'BRIEN

(Mr. SCHRADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHRADER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to former Sheriff John O'Brien, who passed away on June 1 at the age of 74. John was a beloved fixture of the Lincoln County community in my district, where he was known for his dedication to the people he served.

A dedicated Oregon State Beaver, after graduating from OSU, John was drafted in the U.S. Army in 1970, and served in Vietnam where he earned a Vietnam Service Medal and Bronze Star. He returned home and joined the Lincoln County Sheriff's office as a patrol deputy in 1973. It was here that John would find his calling, serving his community and the department for 30 years, the last 9 as sheriff, until his retirement in 2003. After retiring from the Sheriff's office, John worked for the Pacific Northwest region of FEMA, assisting with disasters in Oregon, Alaska, Washington, and New York City.

All who were close to John could attest that he cared about people in an extraordinary way. His generous spirit touched everyone in his life. John dedicated his time to making life better for those he served. He will be missed by all who knew him.

He is survived by his wife of 50 years, Priscilla, as well as his kids, Eric and Erin, and his four grandchildren. I hope they can all find peace during this difficult time as well as mourn the loss of an extraordinary member of this great family.

BIDEN GAS PRICES BURDEN FAMILIES

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, sadly, inflation has increased to over 8 percent, the highest rate in over 40 years. Now family budgets are draining at the pump.

The over \$5 per gallon for gas is the highest ever, caused by failing Biden policies. The American Energy Alliance with Stephen Moore on the Unleash Prosperity Hotline has identified over 100 initiatives enacted by Biden to restrict American oil and gas development.

When Biden took office, gas was \$2.39 a gallon. Now it has doubled. These extremist policies intentionally discourage gas usage without alternatives available to families. Declaring war on American energy subsidizes war criminal Putin's mass murder in Ukraine and allows Iran to proceed with nuclear weapons to fulfill "Death to Israel. Death to America."

America needs price relief through an all-of-the-above energy policy achieved by President Donald Trump.

In conclusion, God bless our troops who have successfully protected America for 20 years in the global war on terrorism as it continues moving from the Afghanistan safe haven to America. Happy birthday, Donald Trump.

DONALD TRUMP LOST THE 2020 ELECTION

(Mr. LIEU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, Donald Trump lost the 2020 Presidential popular vote by over 7 million votes. Trump lost the electoral college 306–232. Trump lost the State of Arizona. Trump lost Nevada. Trump lost Georgia. Trump lost Minnesota. Trump lost Wisconsin. Trump lost Michigan. Trump lost Pennsylvania. Donald Trump lost the 2020 Presidential election.

YET ANOTHER TRUCKING CRISIS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, as we endure more and more of the Biden-induced energy crisis in this country, I have to point out another aspect of that which is very important that we get a handle on soon. Our ability for our trucks to deliver the goods, the products we expect to be in the stores, is going to be hampered even more not just in my home State of California \$7 diesel or \$6 in the rest of the country, and the ability to get truck drivers, but also, interestingly enough, there is a product called diesel exhaust fluid that is part of the newer truck engines that is going to run out.

It is already in short supply. The railroads are having a hard time shipping it. It is not even produced enough in this country. We have to rely on one important component, urea, that the major exporters of it are China, Russia, and Qatar. We are going to run out of the DEF that you put in the trucks. The trucks will not run without it because the computers will not let the truck run without this fluid, which is a component in the diesel exhaust system.

If we run out of DEF, the trucks can't move, and they will not move the products you need, your food, your other supplies to the stores for you to purchase. So we have yet another crisis within a crisis if we run out of DEF. DEF needs to be produced in this country. We need to produce the urea in this country.

FENTANYL CRISIS DESERVES URGENCY

(Mr. MOORE of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOORE of Alabama. Madam Speaker, last year alone fentanyl killed more Americans than any weapon of mass destruction in our Nation's history.

Fentanyl is now the number one cause of death for Americans between the ages of 18 and 45. It is not guns. It is not COVID-19. It is not even car accidents. It is fentanyl.

CDC numbers show more total drug overdose deaths last year in the U.S. than those killed by the atomic bomb blast that ended World War II.

The direct cause of so many American deaths from fentanyl is the Biden

administration's surrender on our southern border. In 2021 alone, more than 11,000 pounds of fentanyl was seized at our southern border. So just imagine how much fentanyl got across the border and into our communities.

Fentanyl is a drug so deadly poisonous that the Russian military has reportedly weaponized it. Countless families who have lost loved ones to fentanyl deserve better than what we are getting from this administration.

That is why I cosponsored Congresswoman BOBBERT's Fentanyl is a WMD Act, a designation that follows the 2019 proposal from the Trump administration that would enable our government to treat the fentanyl crisis with the urgency that it deserves.

We can't turn the other way as the Mexican drug cartels kill thousands of young Americans. We must take the fentanyl threat seriously, and we must secure our border.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

SUPREME COURT POLICE PARITY ACT OF 2022

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4160) to amend title 40, United States Code, to grant the Supreme Court of the United States security-related authorities equivalent to the legislative and executive branches.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 4160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Supreme Court Police Parity Act of 2022".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO PROTECT FAMILY MEMBERS.

Section 6121(a)(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by adding "and" after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) any member of the immediate family of the Chief Justice, any Associate Justice, or any officer of the Supreme Court if the Marshal determines such protection is necessary."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. LIEU) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 4160.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 4160, the Supreme Court Police Parity Act of 2022.

While the Supreme Court police force is currently authorized to provide protection to the Justices of the Supreme Court, this bill would unequivocally extend their authority to provide protection to family members of Justices if there is reason to believe they are at risk.

It is imperative that the Justices are free from fear of violence or physical intimidation to make decisions based on the Constitution and law as applied to the facts of the cases before them. This is essential to the rule of law. Assassilants like the man arrested recently for allegedly plotting against the life of one of our Justices are a threat to our democracy, but with the right security, they can also be stopped before they inflict harm.

I thank Senators COONS and CORNYN for their work on this issue in the Senate, and Representatives STANTON, CORREA, and ISSA for their work in the House, likewise introducing bills that would extend protection to the families of Justices. I also thank Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE as well.

I further note that Mr. STANTON's bill would have also extended protection to the families of Court employees. We understand that there was Republican opposition to that aspect of the bill, and in the interest of protecting the Justices' families, we could no longer delay in passing the only version of the bill they would apparently agree to. But I hope we will swiftly move another bill to extend protection to families of employees as well.

I hope my colleagues will join me in passing this straightforward measure to ensure that the families of Supreme Court Justices have the necessary protection from any threats they may face.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, why did it take so long? Why did it take so long to bring this legislation to the floor? It has been over a month since the leak of the draft opinion, over a month of threats on Supreme Court Justices and their families, over a month of protests at their homes. Why did it take so long? I mean, the protests at their homes are a direct violation of the law, 18 U.S.C. section 1507. Over a month.

It has been over a week, or actually a week, since an assassination attempt on a Supreme Court Justice, on Justice

Kavanaugh. Think about that for a second. An assassination attempt on a sitting United States Supreme Court Justice.

And what did the Speaker of the House say last week? No one is in danger. No rush on this legislation. No concern here.

The Senate passed this bill a month ago. Why hasn't the House? Why did it take so long? I think the answer is obvious. Because they have always wanted to intimidate the Court. That has been their goal since the get-go. Their goal was to intimidate the Court. That has been their objective all along.

Think about the history first. We had the Kavanaugh confirmation mess where the left has made up things about Justice Kavanaugh and his family. Then we had the leader of the Senate, the Democrat leader of the Senate on the Supreme Court steps say to two Justices, Mr. Kavanaugh and Mr. Gorsuch: You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price.

Last April, the Democrat chair of the Judiciary Committee introduced legislation to do what? To pack the Court, to add four Associate Justices to the United States Supreme Court. Why four? Why not one? Why not two? Why not three? Why four? Because four would give them a majority on the Court.

Then there was the sustained attack on Justice Thomas and his wife over the last several weeks. The Democrats on the Judiciary Committee even had hearings about Justice Thomas.

Then, of course, there was the leak of the draft opinion itself, something that has never happened. And then there were the protests at Supreme Court Justices' homes, again in direct violation of the statute.

And then, finally, there was the hearing the Democrats had in the Judiciary Committee about the abortion issue while the Dobbs decision is pending in front of the Court. You remember that hearing. That was the one where the Democrat witness said men could get pregnant. That is the history here.

And then, of course, last week, we had an assassination attempt on Justice Kavanaugh. Intimidation is their goal. It is the same reason the Department of Homeland Security stood up the Disinformation Governance Board. It is the same reason the Department of Justice is targeting parents who have the nerve to show up at a school board meeting and speak up for their kids. It is all about intimidation. That is how the left operates, and we have seen it play out now against the Supreme Court.

But the good news is, finally, this bill is going to pass and give the Justices of the highest Court in our land the protection they and their families deserve. I say better late than never. We support this legislation. It should have passed a darn long time ago.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, let me tell you why it took us a few weeks

rather than just 1 week to pass this legislation. It is because Republicans refused to protect the families of Supreme Court employees who are at risk. Shame on you for not doing that.

And, by the way, there are threats to Justices across the board. I support this legislation. I just note that recently there was an article on CNN titled "Justice Sonia Sotomayor was targeted by gunman, Federal judge tells '60 Minutes,'" dated February 19, 2021. Intimidation goes on both sides.

Madam Speaker, I support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, that is why Republicans have condemned violence every single time it happened. We condemned it when it happened on January 6. But guess what? We also condemned it when it happened in the summer of 2020.

It hasn't been a few weeks since the leak of the draft opinion. It has been 6 weeks. The Senate passed this legislation unanimously, and they wouldn't bring it up. They wouldn't bring it up. In fact, the Speaker of the House, as I said before, the Speaker of the House said last week there was no need to bring it up, but now we are going to. Thank goodness for that.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA), my friend.

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, listening to the initial debate here, you would believe that there was a legitimate difference of opinion here on the floor about protecting the Justices. Clearly, there was no such difference in the U.S. Senate. What there is, though, is a story that I think needs to be told.

□ 1230

When I authored this legislation a month ago, I knew that we had support in the Senate, and I knew that we would have support in the House. The first thing I did was I called up the most senior member of the Judiciary Committee on the other side of the aisle and said to him that I believe we should do this. He agreed. Not checking with staff, he agreed to this simple bill of protecting those who would be intimidated and those who would be threatened and those whose lives could not be replaced in a timely fashion without changing the outcome of the Court. And that was it; I had my cosponsor.

A day later, mysteriously, another bill, very different, was dropped in the hopper by the Speaker's staff. It was done so without a Republican cosponsor, without a call to the ranking member who stands here today. That was done because they wanted to play message with it. They wanted to delay, and the Speaker has delayed for a month.

Madam Speaker, 18 U.S.C. 1507 is not a suggestion that you prevent intimidation of the Court. It is a law. It is a law that the President of the United States has sworn to uphold and,

through his Attorney General, has not, has negated the responsibility.

This legislation is not only essential to protect against another assassination attempt of a Justice or their family, but it is even more important because this administration, as we speak, is not obeying the law that they have sworn to obey, one that the Attorney General is required to. So, it is a double-edged sword that I come with today.

Democrats took 30 days and waited a week after the attempted assassination of a Supreme Court Justice before they would bring a commonsense, non-controversial piece of legislation to the floor. I applaud all of those who will vote for it today, and I suspect that it will be voted for unanimously here on the floor.

But justice delayed, or protection of our Justice delayed, could have led to the death of a Justice and, even as we speak, still could.

Let's pass it. Let's pass it without further controversy. And let's never again do something as shameful as ignore the law and delay protection of people who are being intimidated.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The Republicans are misleading you. Supreme Court Justices already have protection. Let me say that again. Supreme Court Justices already have protection.

This is about families of Supreme Court Justices, which I support them having protection, and Democrats are fighting for families of law clerks and employees of the Supreme Court. They should have protection, too.

Let me tell you the threats to employees of the Supreme Court. Soon after the draft decision leaked, a right-wing activist posted the personal details of a law clerk who he baselessly claimed had leaked Justice Alito's draft opinion overturning *Roe v. Wade*. This rightwing activist even posted the clerk's wedding announcement and singled out the clerk's spouse. Republicans don't want to protect that person or their family.

After another Republican strategist claimed a different law clerk had leaked the opinion, an extremist anti-abortion rights group issued a press release targeting that clerk and the Justice the clerk worked for. The author of the press release had served years in prison for conspiring to blow up an abortion clinic. Referring to the people in the Justice's office, the group's leader said that he could smell their fear.

Republicans don't want to protect the families of Supreme Court employees. Shame on them.

Recently, a news outlet obtained a DHS intelligence report identifying threats to murder Justices and their clerks. Why don't Republicans want to protect the families of Supreme Court employees?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE).

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, unfortunately, this bill is necessary because we have a radical and unhinged leftwing activist group of individuals that also have been encouraged by the slow-walking Democratic Party in hopes of intimidation being used to influence the courts. That is why we are here today.

We have assassination attempts on Judge Kavanaugh. We have fire bombings of women's resource centers and healthcare facilities. We have U.S. Senators, sitting U.S. Senators, encouraging violence against the children and families of Supreme Court Justices.

Ever since the leak took place some 6 weeks ago, there have been at least 14 coordinated attacks on women's pregnancy care facilities, and Democratic leadership has endorsed and encouraged physical threats to their political opposition. This is totally unacceptable. It is un-American.

The unhinged left is not the party that empowers women. If that were true, they would not be trying to destroy women's resource centers, nor would they be trying to attack and intimidate those who work there. They would not be threatening the life of and encouraging violence toward the children of the fourth woman to serve on the United States Supreme Court.

The protests that have been taking place outside the Justices' homes this past month are unacceptable, and Democratic leadership has refused to condemn the threats of violence.

One great example of this is, despite the law and the prohibition against such protests, Jen Psaki, while she was White House press secretary, stated: "... we certainly continue to encourage that outside of judges' homes, and that is the President's position."

This is the position of the Democratic Party: intimidation and fear. Now it is getting out of control. It is about time the Democrats are coming to admit it. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the Senate or its Members.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, Supreme Court Justices are already protected. Really? Really? They are already protected?

The Speaker said no one is in danger, no one is in danger after an assassination attempt. I don't know if I would feel very protected. On the very day of the assassination attempt, in violation of the law, protesters are at the very house of the Supreme Court Justice being intimidated by protesters.

The Speaker says that no one is in danger. I don't want to engage in personalities, so I might say a high-ranking official on the other side of the Capitol here said: You have released

the whirlwind; you don't know what will hit you. And then down the street, Pennsylvania Avenue, a high-ranking official said there might be a mini-revolution.

Does that not sound like intimidation to you? It sure sounds like it to me. I don't know what my friends on the other side of the aisle want to happen. I don't know. I am not in their heads, and I am not in their hearts. But I listen to what they say, and I watch what they do. We should have passed this much longer ago when it was available to us, and the fact that we didn't might be the cause for people to come to assassinate a United States Supreme Court Justice.

This is not a third-world country. If you don't get your way, you don't blow up the Court and kill the Justices. But, apparently, that is what some people in America think is appropriate. It is not appropriate. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me say this. Reading from a headline here, this group, Ruth Sent Us, "... hinted at targeting Supreme Court Justice Barrett's children, church." Let me read the headline here. "Group gave details on Barrett's routine, her children's school, and family's spiritual life."

In plain English, this group was saying where Justice Coney Barrett goes each day, where her kids go to school, and where her family goes to church. They gave those details.

Last week, the Democrats said no one is in danger. After an assassination attempt on Justice Barrett's colleague, Justice Kavanaugh, they said not to worry. Everything is fine. We don't need to pass this legislation after the Senate had done it unanimously. That is the position of the Democrats in this body.

That is why we are saying: Why did it take so long? Six weeks ago was when the draft leak happened, and the protests started at Justices' homes almost immediately after the leak of that draft, that unprecedented leak of that draft opinion. They have been doing it now for weeks and weeks and weeks.

Here is the email from this organization, this Ruth Sent Us organization. Here is one of the messages: "If you are in the D.C. metro area, join us. Our protests at Barrett's home moved the needle to this coverage. Falls Church is a People of Praise stronghold. She sends her seven kids to a People of Praise school that she sat on the board of directors for. She attends church daily," as if that is bad to go to church daily. I think that is a good thing. But this is what they are saying, this group, giving the details of where her kids go to school, where they go to church, and her daily routine.

And the Democrats said: Nothing to worry about.

That is our concern. So thank goodness this bill is here.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am going to respond to that because what he just said is a lie. The fact that he is saying Democrats think there is nothing wrong, there is no danger to Supreme Court Justices, is a lie. Why? Because we are the majority party, and we just put this bill up, and we are about to vote on it. We clearly care about Supreme Court Justices.

But we also care about the families and employees of the Supreme Court, and that is what we are talking about today. Again, I just want to remind you, Republicans are misleading you. Supreme Court Justices right now have law enforcement protection details. They are protected by law enforcement. This bill has to do with the families of Supreme Court Justices. I support protecting them. I also support protecting the employees and their families of the Supreme Court.

That is the dispute. The Democrats want to also protect the employees and families who are getting threats from rightwing activists, intimidation from the far right.

Do you want to talk about intimidation? I will tell you what intimidation is. It is Trump supporters assaulting the Capitol on January 6, brutalizing 140 police officers. That is intimidation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We condemned what took place on January 6. It would have been nice if Democrats would have done the same thing in the summer of 2020 or passed this legislation 6 weeks ago or a month ago when the Senate passed it.

Let me just recite a few things here that have been said by our colleagues on the other side.

Former Attorney General Eric Holder said in 2018, at a campaign event in Georgia, to kick Republicans. "No. No. When they go low, we kick them." That is what this new Democratic Party is about.

It sure is. It is all about intimidation: intimidating the court, intimidating parents who have the nerve to show up at school board meetings, setting up a Disinformation Governance Board to intimidate free speech rights of all Americans. That is what the new Democratic Party is about.

We have seen it time and time again. In the summer of 2018, we saw one of our colleagues from California, a Democrat Member, say: Let's make sure we show up wherever we have to show up. And if you see anybody from the Trump Cabinet in a restaurant, in a department store, at a gasoline station, out in a crowd, you create a crowd and push back on them, and you tell them—think about this. This is a Member of Congress saying this to a Cabinet member—you tell them they are

not welcome anymore, anywhere. A Cabinet member of the administration not welcome in their own darn country? That is what a Member of Congress said on the Democrat side.

We had another Member of Congress on the Democrat side say this: There needs to be “unrest on the streets,” calling for unrest on the streets while there was unrest on the streets in the summer of 2020.

That is why this legislation is so darn important and why we cannot figure out—the gentleman just said something that wasn’t accurate. The Speaker of the House last week said no one is in danger. I just read you what they are posting about Justice Coney Barrett and her family and where they go to church and where her seven kids go to school. Of course, this is in the context of everything they have done to intimidate the Court and an assassination attempt on another Justice, Justice Kavanaugh.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

□ 1245

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I have missed most of the debate on the floor. Mr. JORDAN just made reference to an item that bowls me over. You wonder after you have been in Washington for a little while whether anything will surprise you. Yes, Madam Speaker, that tweet by the pro-abortion group, Ruth Sent Us, that identified Justice Barrett’s church and identified the school that her children attend and encouraged protestors to “voice your anger” by demonstrating there, is a new low.

Not just the identification of Justices’ home addresses, which I never thought we would see, not just the crowds materializing there, which I never thought we would see, not just the appearance of an assassin at the home of a Justice, which we have never seen, and yet, the response is: What about January 6?

As the gentleman from Ohio made the point, I have never encountered any Republican who declined to condemn the violence and rioting at the Capitol that day. I have never found one. I have never heard one. And yet, I never hear condemnation of such conduct as I have described from Democrats. I might be missing it. I am not hearing it now. I am hearing this, What about January 6?

I condemn the rioting and the violence at the Capitol on January 6.

I condemn the Democrat leader of the Senate standing in front of the Supreme Court to say to two specific Justices that, You have released the whirlwind. You will suffer the result. I don’t remember the exact words. And then what I do remember, the phrase that sticks in my mind: “You won’t know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions.” I never hear

condemnation for that. I don’t know why.

I do think I know why this bill had to be delayed from last week when we were here and could have passed it. That is because you want to protect the leaker. That implies that although this has been pending for a month and a half and the Nation doesn’t know who the leaker is, somebody knows who the leaker is; and that is who you want to protect, amazing as that is, unprecedented as that is.

We certainly ought to pass this legislation and protect the Justices of the United States Supreme Court from assassins, assassins responding to the unprecedented advocacy on the left.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I condemn violence whether it is from rightwing groups or leftwing groups or white supremacist groups or any other group. Democrats say this all the time.

I will tell you why Republicans don’t hear it. Because they are in their bubble watching just Fox News, who won’t even show the January 6 hearings. That is why they don’t hear any of this stuff because it is never played to them or their base. Democrats condemn violence all the time.

By the way, last year—I am just going to tell you the headline of this article again: “Justice Sonia Sotomayor was targeted by gunmen . . .” Did Republicans jump up in outrage? No, no, they didn’t.

So let’s just be clear here what we are talking about today, once again: Supreme Court Justices get law enforcement protection right now, as we speak.

This is actually a dispute about employees. So I am going to ask Republicans a question, and I bet you they will not answer it: Why do they not want to protect the employees and their families of the Supreme Court?

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, the employees of the Supreme Court are already protected. This is about protecting the Justices’ families, and we know that is needed based on the headline I read and the email that Mr. BISHOP just talked about.

The gentleman said that Democrats condemn violence. No, they don’t. No, they don’t. They called rioters and looters the entire summer of 2020, they called them “peaceful protestors.” And that same summer, then-Senator now-Vice President HARRIS raised money to bail those rioters and looters and people who went after the police out of jail. So you have got to stick with the facts here, and that is just not accurate what was stated earlier.

For all the reasons we have highlighted, Madam Speaker, we are glad this bill is finally going to pass. We just wish it would have happened when it should have, weeks and weeks ago when this threat was first present for Supreme Court Justices.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. ESCOBAR).

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, it is incredible to stand here and listen to our Republican colleagues talk about the risks and the dangers that exist to the Supreme Court.

I want to know where they were when the risks and the dangers existed for my community, El Paso, Texas, where 23 innocent people were slaughtered by a white supremacist with an AK-47? Where were they then? How about Uvalde? Where were they then? How about every other mass shooting? Buffalo? You name it.

Last week, we brought to the floor legislation intended to protect millions of Americans, especially and including children. The vast majority of our Republican colleagues voted against those protections for vulnerable people who don’t have access to 24-hour, round-the-clock U.S. Marshal protection. They don’t have access to round-the-clock, 24/7 Capitol Police protection, which Supreme Court Justices have today. Supreme Court Justices have far more protections than Members of Congress do, but more importantly they have more than those innocent lives that were taken in innumerable cities across America.

And as they rail about and clutch their pearls over the fact that it took House Democrats some time to get this bill to the floor, the reason it took that much time is because it was House Democrats that at least wanted to get one itty-bitty concession out of this bill to protect the staff of that institution, the United States Supreme Court. But they refused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Madam Speaker, I remind the American public why they brought this bill to the floor, both in the Senate and here; it is a talking point. It is not because it really does anything, it is simply a talking point. It came as a result of a leaked decision on the Justices’ desire to take away women’s reproductive care.

Guess who else doesn’t get protections in America the way that they would like to protect others? It is those healthcare providers and patients and staff who are vulnerable every day, especially because of the actions of the Supreme Court.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, a talking point? The left is telling people where Justice Barrett’s kids go to school. That is not a talking point, that is a fact. That is one of the craziest things I have heard said on this floor.

A talking point? Every single Senator voted for this package. That includes Democrats. Every single one.

A talking point? You have got to be kidding me.

They are reporting where a Supreme Court Justice's kids go to school, where her family goes to church, her daily routine, and the left calls it a talking point?

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, S. 4160 is a straightforward bill that will protect the families of the Justices. Democrats also fought to try to protect the families of Supreme Court employees. Republicans objected and won't do that, so this is the best we can get.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LIEU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 4160.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. LIEU. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2543, FEDERAL RESERVE RACIAL AND ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2773, RECOVERING AMERICA'S WILDLIFE ACT OF 2021; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 7606, MEAT AND POULTRY SPECIAL INVESTIGATOR ACT OF 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1170 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1170

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2543) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to add additional demographic reporting requirements, to modify the goals of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Financial Services now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-49, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate

equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 2 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. After debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to the first section of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Financial Services or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 4. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2773) to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-47, modified by the amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 6 of this resolution; (3) the amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution; and (4) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. After debate pursuant to section 5 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 7 of this resolution shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in

the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 7. It shall be in order at any time after debate pursuant to section 5 of this resolution for the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

SEC. 8. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part D of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in section 7 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 9. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 7606) to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters within the Department of Agriculture. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-50, modified by the amendment printed in part E of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture or their respective designees; (2) the further amendments described in section 10 of this resolution; and (3) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 10. After debate pursuant to section 9 of this resolution, each further amendment printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. All points of order against the further amendments printed in part F of the report of the Committee on Rules are waived.

SEC. 11. House Resolution 188, agreed to March 8, 2021 (as most recently amended by House Resolution 1153, agreed to June 8, 2022), is amended by striking "June 17, 2022" each place it appears and inserting (in each instance) "June 22, 2022".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

RESCHENTHALER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1170, for three measures.

First, it provides for consideration of H.R. 2543 under a structured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment, provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, makes in order 27 amendments, and provides one motion to recommit.

Second, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2773 under a structured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment, provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources, makes in order eight amendments, and provides one motion to recommit.

Third, the rule provides for consideration of H.R. 7606 under a structured rule. The rule self-executes a manager's amendment, provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, makes in order two amendments, and provides one motion to recommit.

Finally, the rule extends recess instructions, suspension authority, and same day authority through June 22, 2022.

First, I will say a few words about the Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act. Times are tough for working families across our country. Food prices are rising and gas prices are at an all-time high. At the same time, food companies and Big Oil are making record profits at the expense of these same hard-working Americans.

Costs are rising up and down the supply chain. The cost of fertilizer and pesticides has risen 50 percent over the past year, in part due to the ongoing war in Ukraine. Rising energy prices, increasing trucking costs, and the worst outbreak of avian flu in 7 years are all contributing to the higher prices consumers are paying at the grocery store.

Plus, combine oil companies' irresponsibility with Putin's war in Ukraine, and you have an unbearable situation for American consumers. The Lower Food and Fuel Costs Act will help us look out for working families,

not just big corporations and their billionaire CEOs. This package of bipartisan legislation supports farmers and lowers prices for America's families at the grocery store and at the gas pump.

This rule also allows us to consider a package of legislation aimed at addressing racial and economic inequities that limit opportunities for Americans to buy homes, access loans, and earn fair wages.

Income and wealth inequality is higher in the United States than in any other developed country, and there are examples of it in almost all parts of our lives. The reforms in this package will help us better target and measure outcomes for underserved populations.

Finally, the Recovering America's Wildlife Act helps protect the more than one-third of all fish and wildlife species in the United States that are at risk of extinction.

This legislation funds conservation efforts for more than 12,000 species of wildlife and plants, and the recovery of 1,600 species already listed as threatened or endangered.

Taken together and taken separately, these bills will all lead to real important change for Americans.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, the rule before us provides for consideration of three pieces of legislation that are, once again, missed opportunities to provide real relief to the American people.

Rather than working with Republicans to address the serious issues facing our Nation, Democrats again prioritize the interests of far-left special interest groups and their radical progressive base over the needs of American workers and American families.

Look no further than H.R. 2543, a compilation of 13 Committee on Financial Services' bills that prioritize woke policies and unnecessary reporting over actually fixing Biden's economic crisis.

As my friends across the aisle will remember, under President Trump, U.S. employment reached a 50-year low of 3.5 percent. Additionally, under President Trump, minority unemployment dropped to the lowest levels on record.

Compare that with the economy under the Democrats' one-party rule. Inflation is now at a 40-year high. Gas prices are now over \$5 a gallon. Americans can expect to pay an extra \$5,200 this year compared to last year for the same goods and services.

Once again, rather than just working with Republicans to provide real economic relief, the Democrats continue to double down on reckless spending, far-left policies, and have prioritized their Big Government socialism over free market principles. What has this led to?

It has led to economic instability. It threatens the stability of our Federal

Reserve. It piles regulatory costs on small businesses. It emboldens unelected and unaccountable career bureaucrats.

Ultimately, H.R. 2543 will make it more difficult for low-income and minority borrowers to start a business, to buy a home, and to build credit. It actually does the opposite of the intended effect.

This will also provide for consideration of H.R. 7606, a bill that claims to lower food costs by appointing a "special investigator," and this special investigator will investigate American meat packers and live poultry dealers.

Let's be clear, this legislation is a weak attempt to lay the blame for President Biden's economic crisis on American job creators. In reality, this is just another unfunded mandate that empowers Washington bureaucrats and places new burdens on American food producers.

Alarming, these compliance costs may actually raise the price of food even higher, making life in Joe Biden's America even harder on average American families.

Finally, this bill provides for consideration of H.R. 2773, the Recovering America's Wildlife Act of 2022. While I support conservation efforts, I am incredibly disappointed once again by the majority walking away from talks with Republicans to find offsets and to try to resolve spending concerns for the \$1.34 billion in new annual mandatory spending authorized by this bill.

In fact, according to the CBO, this legislation spends \$12.7 billion just in the first 10 years alone.

Madam Speaker, 80 percent of Americans say inflation is the most important issue facing this country. You wouldn't know it by looking at the bills Democrats are prioritizing for floor action this week.

□ 1315

Perhaps it is time that my Big Government, Democratic colleagues actually listen to the American people and work with Republicans on real economic solutions rather than doubling down on the out-of-control spending and reckless far-left policies that created Biden's economic crisis in the first place.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" to oppose this rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I always, as we have these debates with my good friend from Pennsylvania, encourage that we do work together acknowledging that we have differences of opinion and reminding people who are maybe watching that we are in a global economy that has inflation globally and that what we are doing in this package is to try to provide some small instruments for oversight accountability so that we can have as much control as we can in a global economy that is impacting this inflation that is so hard for working Americans.

So with all due respect to my friend from Pennsylvania, I am always willing to work with him. But this package is intended to provide more accountability, not more bureaucracy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I hear about this being a global issue. It is a global issue, but the reason it is a global issue—quick economics lesson—we are still the reserve currency. We also are the largest GDP. We are exporting the inflation to other countries.

Let's be clear. The inflation is caused by Joe Biden's reckless, Big Government, socialist agenda and, unfortunately, the American people as well as the world have to deal with this recklessness.

Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), who is my good friend on the Rules Committee.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I would like to start off by saying that I am going to specifically talk about H.R. 7606. Many of the bills included in that bill, in H.R. 7606, I supported and helped introduce. The Butcher Block Act, year-round E-15, and the PRECISE Act are all pieces of legislation I have long supported and are included in this package.

I find it stunning that my colleagues in the majority after many months of sitting on these thoughtful, bipartisan bills are finally bringing them forward attached to a poison pill that is duplicative and unnecessary.

Perhaps most disappointing is that this bill is being advertised as an immediate solution to skyrocketing food and fuel prices. But many of these bills are simply codifications of existing programs or duplicative of other efforts all packaged with a feel-good title.

Let me be clear. These will not address the underlying drivers of inflation or increasing input costs. If the majority were serious about bringing down the cost of our food and fuel, they would check their incessant spending habits far beyond the Federal Government's means. They would roll back the Biden administration's regulatory war on agriculture.

But that is not what this bill does.

Madam Speaker, the Packers and Stockyards Division already has enforcement tools at their disposal to address uncompetitive behavior in the meatpacking sector. However, by the Packers and Stockyards Division's own estimates, the agency is chronically understaffed and underfunded. If my colleagues were serious about combating uncompetitive behavior in the meatpacking industry, they would have included robust resources to enhance enforcement under the Packers and Stockyard Act.

This legislation is unfunded and creates an unnecessary and duplicative special investigator appointed by an

administration that blames rising costs of goods and services on everyone but themselves and is empowered with nearly unlimited authority to harass market participants when convenient for the politics of this administration.

Further, the Department of Justice has already been in the process of investigating meatpackers with respect to this exact issue.

I would ask my colleague if they have yet to receive any update regarding this effort? And if so, what can we expect from it? I know many of my Republican colleagues and I have been seeking an update for months to no avail. Absent such investigation, it is inappropriate for this bill to move forward.

Much of this package does have bipartisan support, but when I asked why the majority didn't focus on the bills with strong bipartisan consensus, I was essentially told that this is the package, this is what the majority wants. The message to me was, Take it or leave it. This shows, once again, the majority's unwillingness to work in a bipartisan manner and really, really address the issues facing Americans.

That is unfortunate, and I urge my colleagues in the majority to work with Republicans in addressing these issues in a thoughtful and bipartisan manner and to stop playing politics while our country suffers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, Americans are now paying an average of over \$5 for a gallon of gas. This is the first time in history this has happened. Let me repeat that: over \$5 for a gallon of gas.

The pain at the pump is a direct result of President Biden's and congressional Democrats' radical Green New Deal agenda and a war on American energy producers.

Let's just be blunt about something: the base of the Democratic Party—the bunch of woke yuppies sitting at home on Zooms all day—don't care about gas prices. But if you are someone who has to swing a hammer for a living and drive to a jobsite, if you are a waitress at a diner and you have to drive to your shift, that affects you.

Republicans care about working families and working men and women. That is why we believe Americans deserve affordable, American-made energy. That is why if we defeat the previous question, I will personally offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, here to explain this amendment is my good friend and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Congressman JEFF DUNCAN from South Carolina.

Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the previous question so that we can amend the rule to immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act.

As a direct result of President Biden's war on American energy, average national gas prices have hit \$5 per gallon. I don't know what they are in Michigan. I know I pay more than \$5 a gallon for diesel fuel in South Carolina.

This is the worst energy crisis we have seen since 1973. Why we had an energy crisis in the seventies was supply and demand. We had lessening global supply and increased demand as the economy was growing.

When will we learn?

The American people are feeling the pain directly due to the policies of the Biden administration. This shouldn't come as any surprise to the American people. It really doesn't because the President said during a Presidential debate that he would phase out oil and gas production in the United States, and that is exactly what they are doing. It is costing moms and dads around the country, and Democrats are wondering why gas prices are so high. It is unbelievable.

What is even more unbelievable is that President Biden killed American energy at the same time green-lighting Vladimir Putin's Nord Stream 2 project to allow Vladimir Putin to produce energy and sell it to Europe. We can't do that here at home.

The logic of Joe Biden and the Democrats: kill American energy while promoting energy development of tyrants in Russia, Iran, and Venezuela is unbelievable.

It is simple. You are playing politics with this country's energy crisis. Democrats want high gas prices so they can push their fallacy of a utopian world of wind, solar, and EVs for all. Meanwhile, American families are choosing between filling up their tank, feeding their families, and not doing other things they are used to doing because they are having to pay more at the pump.

Energy prices hurt low-income Americans the hardest. They are seeing their savings erode in a volatile stock market. More of their paychecks are going for basic commodities due to rampant high inflation, and they are paying record-high prices nationwide to fuel their vehicles.

Energy Secretary Granholm's solution for high gas prices? Buy a \$55,000

electric vehicle. They can range up to \$90,000.

How many American families can afford that?

Even the Biden administration knows that is a failed approach.

I saw a Democrat plan recently that we are going to use more of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to increase supply. Okay. You acknowledge there is a supply-and-demand issue. They are currently tapping the SPR at record levels to meet rising demand. The SPR fell to 538 billion barrels just last month, and that is the lowest level since 1987.

Madam Speaker, that is a finite commodity that once we drain the SPR, unless you produce more energy or buy oil from Iran, Venezuela, or Russia to replenish it—it is not an infinite supply—what are you going to do then?

What are we going to do then when that runs out?

If Americans want to blame someone for record-high gas prices, then look no further than House Democrats who have already blocked Representative CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS' bill, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act, six times. If Democrats block it today, then it will be the seventh time they have blocked a commonsense piece of legislation that is a Republican solution. Now, this bill will approve the Keystone XL pipeline, remove all restrictions on LNG exports, and restart oil and gas leasing on Federal lands and waters.

It is well past time for the Democrats to wake up and follow the science, as they like to say. Stop putting special interest groups before the American people.

Let's flip the switch. Let's support American energy and America first policies. Let's support the American Energy Independence from Russia Act to unleash American energy production and security. Let's take the first step toward lowering gas prices for Americans and quit playing games. We are going to release the SPR oil to increase supply to lower the price at the pump because that is temporary, because once that supply is used up, we are not going to have that to put back into the market. Quit doing that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from South Carolina an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DUNCAN. Flip the switch, folks. Let's support American energy independence.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so the House can immediately consider this commonsense legislation by CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I just want to remind folks that 50 percent of inflation is caused by the war in Ukraine and ac-

tions by Vladimir Putin. In terms of energy, we believe in supporting American energy, but we also accept the reality that we are transitioning to more choices in energy like we do in California.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a June 10, 2021, USA Today article titled: "Fact check: Rising gas prices due to high demand and low supply, not Biden's policies."

[From USA Today, June 10, 2021]

FACT CHECK: RISING GAS PRICES DUE TO HIGH DEMAND AND LOW SUPPLY, NOT BIDEN'S POLICIES

(By Miriam Fautzia)

THE CLAIM: JOE BIDEN IS TO BLAME FOR HIGHER GAS PRICES

The rising cost of gasoline is being felt across the U.S., as the national average price has gone up from \$2 per gallon last year to \$3 per gallon as of June 9, according to data from the American Automobile Association.

Many on social media claim President Joe Biden is to blame for this change. A June 1 Instagram post put the title "Joe Biden's America" atop a graphic showing the price jump from January to May 2021.

"Man I haven't seen gas prices this high since the last time (a) Democrat was in office!" claims one meme shared to Facebook on May 22.

"It's called the Biden effect," commented one Facebook user under a similar May 18 Facebook post. Blaming Biden for this uptick isn't a new phenomenon. These claims have been in circulation since January and particularly allege Biden's cancellation of the Keystone XL pipeline significantly impacted gasoline, "ensur(ing) a huge increase in gas prices for millions of us." USA TODAY has reached out to the posters for comment.

While it's true gasoline prices have risen significantly since Biden took office on Jan. 20 the upward trend predates Biden's time in office and is related to COVID-19 and market factors, not who occupies the White House.

PANDEMIC'S EFFECT ON SUPPLY AND DEMAND

As with any commodity, the price of gasoline is determined by the simple balance of supply and demand: a high supply and low demand means low prices, while a low supply and high demand mean prices rise.

The most important driver of this fluctuation is crude oil, from which gasoline is derived. This fossil fuel typically accounts for between 50 percent and 60 percent of the price at the pump, said Jeanette McGee, a spokesperson for AAA.

In 2020, crude oil prices became extremely cheap, so much so it was being traded at negative prices, McGee told USA TODAY. Brent crude oil, for example, a blend supplying most of Europe, was being sold at \$9 a barrel, its lowest price in decades, the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) reported.

The primary reason for this drop in crude oil prices was the pandemic, said McGee and Mark Finley, a fellow at Rice University's Center for Energy Studies.

"The pandemic drove the world's oil market to become massively oversupplied, inventory dramatically increased and prices collapsed," Finley told USA TODAY.

In response to the low demand due to reduced travel and lockdown restrictions, Finley said major oil-producing countries like Russia, Saudi Arabia and member countries of the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, or OPEC, decided to cut down on their own oil production. But the cut meant oil producers weren't ready to meet the demand for crude oil once it renewed this year thanks to easing of COVID-19-related restrictions.

"This year, demand has so far increased more quickly than production rates, which means the United States had to draw more on its gasoline storage inventories, which has contributed to prices going up," EIA spokesperson Chris Higginbotham said in an email to USA TODAY. "We expect oil producers in the United States and globally to increase their production levels through 2022, which we expect to contribute to lower crude oil prices, and lower gasoline prices."

GAS PRICE UPTREND PREDATES BIDEN

While presidential actions and policies can have some impact on the crude oil market, they don't have as much influence over gasoline prices as one might think.

"Some of (a president's) decisions can impact or contribute to market changes, which can then impact (future) crude oil, but they don't dictate gas prices," said McGee. "If you go back and look at historical data, whether it was Bush, Obama, Trump or Biden, (gas prices) go up and down no matter who's in office."

During former President Donald Trump's term, the national average for gasoline had gone up to nearly \$3 a gallon in May 2018 and hovered close to that price until fall 2018, according to data maintained by AAA. The cost rose yet again to nearly \$3 a gallon in May 2019 before dropping slightly below \$2 per gallon when state and local governments mandated lockdowns in March 2020.

Gas prices slowly crept from \$2.20 per gallon in September 2020 to \$2.40 by the time Biden took office in January 2021. McGee said elections typically drive gasoline prices up.

This upward trend was expected to continue due to pandemic recovery, reduced crude oil supply and the approach of summer—historically considered a peak travel season—but arrived sooner due to the ransomware attack on the Colonial Pipeline, the East Coast's major fuel supplier.

"We have expected gas prices to hit \$3 a gallon around Memorial Day, but with the (Colonial) pipeline offline, it actually jumped the national average to \$3 and more prior to Memorial Day," said McGee.

KEYSTONE XL, OTHER BIDEN POLICIES DON'T AFFECT TODAY'S GASOLINE COSTS

Many critics point to Biden's decision on the Keystone XL pipeline as fueling the gas price spike, but experts say there's no such connection.

The extension of the Keystone pipeline, first proposed in 2008 by TC Energy based in Calgary, Canada, was rejected by former President Barack Obama in November 2015 but later approved by Trump in March 2017. Biden then suspended the project in January. And on June 9, TC Energy announced it was terminating the project.

Even if construction wasn't halted, the Keystone XL pipeline wasn't in operation and therefore wouldn't have an impact on current gas prices, said Finley of Rice University.

"That was something that would impact down the road," he said.

David Dismukes, economist and executive director of Louisiana State University's Center for Energy Studies, agreed, telling USA TODAY the pipeline would have had a "longer-run impact in providing a diversity of supply for refineries in the Gulf Coast."

Similarly, other energy policies rolled out by President Biden, such as postponing oil lease sales, have a long-term, but not short-term, effect.

"If you look at some of the actions taken by the administration with regard to offshore drilling, drilling on federal lands, the outlook for fossil fuel energies in general, those are impacting the price of crude and expectations about crude oil," said

Diskmukes. “(Biden’s policies do) have an impact, but that’s not what you’re seeing at the pump right now.”

OUR RATING: FALSE

Based on our research, we rate FALSE the claim President Joe Biden is to blame for the current higher gas prices. The upward trend in gas costs we see now began months before Biden took office. Because of reduced demand amid the COVID-19 pandemic, oil companies had to cut back on the amount of crude oil produced. Now with restrictions being lifted and more travel happening, the demand has increased, which, coupled with lagging supply, has led to increased gasoline prices. Canceling the Keystone XL pipeline and other energy policies enacted by Biden have a long-term effect on crude oil supply but no present impact on gasoline prices.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, President Biden nor his administration have direct control of setting gas prices. The real issue is Big Oil’s desire to pad their profits.

The CEO of Occidental Petroleum said it herself, “I feel now that we do need to return cash to the shareholders in the form of dividends or buybacks, especially during the better cycles.”

They are thinking in their shareholders’ best interest, not the interest of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, Democrats and their allies on the left can blame Putin all they want, and it is partially true that Putin’s war in Ukraine is partially to blame. But gas prices have risen every month of this administration. Every month they were up a dollar a gallon before Putin even invaded Ukraine.

The real issue here is supply.

Why do we have the supply issue?

It is because Joe Biden on day number one canceled the Keystone XL pipeline. That dried up all capital investment into hydrocarbon infrastructure. Maybe it is a problem because we cannot get the oil and gas to refineries to make sure that we have a supply.

So what does Joe Biden do instead?

He blames everybody else. He goes to Venezuela and elsewhere, and begs them to produce more oil when just one administration before under President Trump, we were actually a net exporter of energy. Biden and House Democrats have created this mess, and the American people know that.

Are you ready for this fact, Madam Speaker?

The American people will also spend \$5,000 this year on gas—\$5,000 for the average American. That is a 78 percent increase from a year ago. In other words, Americans are spending over \$2,000 extra a year on gas under Joe Biden.

Blame who you want, Madam Speaker, but every time an American looks up and sees \$100-plus on that gas tank that he or she just filled up, they know who to blame—Joe Biden and Democrats.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. VAN DUYN).

Ms. VAN DUYN. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act, to address U.S. energy security, the production of oil and gas, and the importation and exportation of oil and gas.

Gas prices have already topped \$5 per gallon, and economists are predicting they will be \$6 per gallon by August. Every American driver is paying nearly double since Biden took office, and the crisis is only getting worse.

□ 1330

This administration should have seen this coming. You can say what you want. You can blame whoever you want. This administration is failing to recognize that its policies have had a direct result on gas prices.

You don’t block crucial pipelines. You don’t block domestic infrastructure. You don’t shut down drilling on Federal lands, declare war on the oil and gas industry, and become reliant on Russian oil and not expect prices to skyrocket and our global standing to weaken.

This administration is obviously not going to do anything but make this crisis worse, so this body must act.

The American Energy Independence from Russia Act will strengthen U.S. energy security, counter Russia, create American jobs, and protect domestic oil and gas dependency and production.

Republicans have proposed countless pragmatic bills, including the Strategy to Secure Offshore Energy Act, which I recently introduced. This directs the Department of the Interior to publish the next 5-year plan for offshore oil and gas lease sales.

We must hold this administration accountable as they continue to throw their hands up and blame everyone else for the energy crisis that they created. This bill will help provide the certainty necessary for continued investment in offshore production and support our domestic energy security.

In my colleague’s home State of California, gas has reached \$9.60 a gallon. Surely, we can all agree that that is unconscionable and must be addressed.

Madam Speaker, I urge opposition to the previous question so that we can pass needed legislation to put us back on course to unlocking American energy independence.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, just some quick facts. As Mr. DUNCAN stated, House Democrats have blocked consideration of legislation to unleash America’s energy independence six times. Six times we have been down this road, and House Democrats have blocked it.

Gas prices have gone up 49 cents since the last time Republicans asked Democrats to bring this bill to the floor. Here we are again.

To talk more about this issue, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858 to unleash American domestic energy production.

Americans across the country are paying sky-high prices at the gas pump. Almost every single day for the past month, gas prices have hit a new record high.

The national average for a gallon of gas is now over \$5 per gallon. In Phoenix, my home State, Arizonans are paying over \$5.60 per gallon. I think yesterday it was \$5.63 per gallon.

Filling up at the pump is becoming increasingly unaffordable for many Americans. As Members of Congress, many of us can afford to spend \$5 for a single gallon of gas. But many Americans, like my own kids, who are working hard, and my senior citizens in my district who live on fixed incomes, simply can’t afford to pay this high price.

Republicans have a solution. We have a plan to increase American energy production today and lower prices tomorrow, if only my colleagues across the aisle would agree to take up this legislation.

H.R. 6858 requires the President to submit an energy security plan to Congress and requires the Energy Secretary to develop a plan to increase oil and gas production on U.S. Federal lands. This legislation reinstates the Keystone XL pipeline, unleashes American natural gas production and oil production, and reverses the oil and gas moratorium on Federal lands and waters so we can harness our U.S.-abundant energy resources.

Republicans have brought up this legislation, as has been said before, for consideration several times, but the energy crisis just keeps getting worse and worse, and gas prices keep getting higher.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), my friend and a former police officer.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act, which I am proud to cosponsor with my colleagues, Representatives McMorris Rodgers and WESTERMAN.

The national average price for a gallon of gasoline today is \$5 and climbing. Let that sink in. It is \$5 and going up. Diesel fuel is skyrocketing at an even scarier rate.

This is a self-imposed crisis on the American people. As a candidate, Joe Biden pledged again and again to ban development on America’s Federal lands and waters. He followed through

on that promise, with the House Democrats following suit no matter the pain they cause Americans at the pump, no matter the costs they impose on businesses reliant on shipping, trucking, and more.

In contrast, we Republicans are here offering solutions. H.R. 6858 takes away Joe Biden's power to ruin our energy security and our economy by prohibiting harmful drilling bans. The bill creates a minimum number of annual lease sales, both onshore and offshore. It reauthorizes the Keystone XL pipeline so we can resume moving energy throughout our country.

Democrats here are calculating that, to reduce emissions, it is a necessary evil to make gas expensive for Americans and punish the middle class.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you why that is dead wrong. Under President Trump, when we were net exporters of American energy, we averaged emission reductions of 2.5 percent every year. Under President Biden, his first year in office, we saw a 6 percent jump in domestic emissions.

These policies Democrats push every day, again, are punishing the American families, the American workers, and the American middle class. It makes it harder for businesses to turn a profit. It is the leading cause of why our economy officially became a bear market just yesterday.

Biden's solution? Trips to Venezuela and Saudi Arabia, pleading with communists and human rights violators to bail him out of a problem that he caused. Let that sink in. He is going to Venezuela and Saudi Arabia, pleading with communists and human rights violators to bail him out of a problem that he caused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to my good friend to close.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, it does not have to be this way. We can bring gas prices down with Republican solutions.

As the ranking member of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee, I call on my colleagues in this body today to do the right thing and vote for H.R. 6858 to bring relief to the American people.

Let's produce our energy right here in America. We have the resources, technology, and the workforce, and we absolutely have the need.

Madam Speaker, I urge defeat of the previous question.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I still find it somewhat amusing that my friends across the aisle continue to blame all this on foreign nations and their actions.

Let me give a quick history lesson on how President Joe Biden and Democrats actually caused this crisis.

Number one, day number one, Joe Biden canceled the Keystone XL pipeline.

Number two, he emboldened Putin with Nord Stream 2. I would actually argue he emboldened Putin to invade Ukraine when he recklessly pulled us out of Afghanistan, which served zero military purpose. But I digress.

Additionally, Joe Biden suspended oil and gas leasing on Federal lands. He delayed permits for energy and infrastructure pipelines. He drained the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. He revoked permits for critical mineral projects. He canceled oil leases in Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico.

What has this done to gas prices? Well, in California, gas prices are now \$9 a gallon.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my neighbor from Pennsylvania for the time here today and for this effort.

I also oppose the previous question and want to, instead, bring forward H.R. 6858, the American Energy Independence from Russia Act. It really begs the question: With what is going on in the world, why are we dependent upon Russia for anything, especially our energy?

If the number was somewhere around 7 percent of the barrels of oil we use, we can easily make it up by our own production in this country, the amazing hydraulic fracturing that put America back on the map for being an exporter of natural gas and all the other development that we can be doing to bring prices back down.

This administration just seems impervious to the suffering of the American people right now on the cost of energy and the cost of just about everything else.

Well, there is another crisis that is going to be coming out of this, too. We are dependent on Russia and China for a product called urea. Now, what is that? Well, it is made into a fertilizer, basically, that is used extensively in American crops. Also, urea has a use as a component in what is called diesel exhaust fluid. That is a part of making our diesel engines run clean on our trucks and tractors and whatever else uses a diesel engine with DEF in it.

We are going to run out of DEF pretty soon. The railroads are having a hard time delivering it. When that happens, that means our trucks don't run anymore because they will not run without this fluid.

So, we are dependent on Russia for urea, dependent on Russia for energy, and want to blame Russia for everything. No. We blame this administration because we are not doing the steps it takes to make ourselves independent that we easily have within our grasp to do in order to go for what is this great reset or the incredible transition the President talks about.

We are being transitioned by this administration, and it is very dangerous. It is harmful to families, harmful to people's bottom lines on running their

households, going to work, getting their kids to school, all because we don't have an energy policy that works.

Whether the trucks don't have DEF to be able to deliver the goods to the store or get it out of the field, whatever it is, because we are dependent on Russia for energy and all these things, we are putting ourselves in a real bad spot.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I am prepared to close.

I yield myself the balance of my time and remind everybody that, in Joe Biden's America, gas prices are averaging more than \$5 a gallon; inflation is at a 40-year high; and real wages have decreased 10 out of the last 12 months.

Yet, with today's rule, House Democrats are doubling down on far-left, radical policies, really failed policies, that created Joe Biden's economic crisis in the first place.

It is well past time that the Biden administration and congressional Democrats admit that they are to blame for the economic pain families are facing and workers are facing, and work with Republicans on solutions to immediately help the American people.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and "no" on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank my friend from Pennsylvania and the Rules Committee for his remarks.

I remind folks that the economy under Joe Biden has created over 8 million jobs since he took office. The unemployment rate has dropped from 6.4 percent to 3.6 percent under President Biden. And his first year was the greatest year of job creation in American history.

The Federal Reserve has found that household financial well-being reached an all-time high last year. GDP grew in the President's first year by 5.2 percent, the fastest rate since 1984.

The U.S. was the first advanced economy that reached prepandemic rates of growth, and we are seeing wages increase for workers.

□ 1345

There is no doubt that inflation and the high cost of gasoline are a challenge. That is the purpose of some of our actions today. It is to hold the private sector accountable, to be responsible to their consumers and the American people. That is why these bills are on the floor, to do something about inflation and the high cost of energy.

At the same time, we are preparing for an energy transition. Michigan, California, we are aware of the realities of the current energy economy, but we are getting ready for the new one.

In the area I represent, Madam Speaker—you have been out to visit me—I have five refineries. I have represented them in local, State, and Federal Government. Two of them are closed because of the pandemic. They are about to reopen using biofuels that will help everybody, and they are a better business model, according to the oil industry. So all of these things have combined for a challenge.

I would agree with my colleague. This is too important, although we have our differences about the approach, that we should engage in problem-solving for Americans.

I thank all of my colleagues for these bills and their ideas to deal with inflation and the challenges to American workers. Each of these bills in this rule are worthwhile and impactful, and I look forward to voting for them all soon.

I urge a “yes” vote on the rule and the previous question.

The text of the material previously referred to by Mr. RESCHENTHALER is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1170

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 12. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 6858) to strengthen United States energy security, encourage domestic production of crude oil, petroleum products, and natural gas, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 13. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 6858.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

Motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 4160.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 199, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 259]

YEAS—216

Adams	Golden	Norcross
Aguilar	Gomez	O'Halleran
Allred	Gonzalez,	Ocasio-Cortez
Auchincloss	Vicente	Omar
Axne	Gottheimer	Pallone
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Panetta
Bass	Grijalva	Pappas
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Pascarell
Bera	Hayes	Payne
Beyer	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Peters
Blumenauer	Horsford	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Houlahan	Pingree
Bonamici	Hoyer	Pocan
Bourdeaux	Huffman	Porter
Bowman	Jackson Lee	Pressley
Boyle, Brendan F.	Jacobs (CA)	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Jayapal	Quigley
Brown (OH)	Jeffries	Raskin
Brownley	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Bush	Johnson (TX)	Ross
Bustos	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Kahele	Ruiz
Carbajal	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Keating	Rush
Carson	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Carter (LA)	Khanna	Sánchez
Cartwright	Kildee	Sarbanes
Case	Kilmer	Scanlon
Castro (TX)	Kim (NJ)	Schakowsky
Cherfilus-	Kind	Schiff
McCormick	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Chu	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Cicilline	Kuster	Schrier
Clark (MA)	Lamb	Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Scott, David
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sherill
Connolly	Lawrence	Sires
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Correa	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lee (NV)	Soto
Courtney	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Craig	Levin (CA)	Speier
Crist	Levin (MI)	Stansbury
Crow	Lieu	Stanton
Cuellar	Lofgren	Stevens
Davids (KS)	Lowenthal	Strickland
Davis, Danny K.	Luria	Suozzi
Dean	Lynch	Swalwell
DeFazio	Malinowski	Takano
DeGette	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Demings	Manning	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	Matsui	Tonko
Deutch	McBath	Torres (CA)
Dingell	McCollum	Torres (NY)
Doggett	McEachin	Trahan
Doyle, Michael F.	McGovern	Trone
Escobar	McNerney	Underwood
Eshoo	Meeks	Vargas
Españat	Meng	Veasey
Evans	Mfume	Velázquez
Fletcher	Moore (WI)	Wasserman
Foster	Moule	Schultz
Frankel, Lois	Moulton	Waters
Gaetz	Mrvan	Watson Coleman
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Garamendi	Nadler	Wexton
García (IL)	Napolitano	Wild
García (TX)	Neal	Williams (GA)
	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
	Newman	Yarmuth

NAYS—199

Aderholt	Buck	Curtis
Allen	Bucshon	Davidson
Amodei	Budd	Davis, Rodney
Armstrong	Burchett	DesJarlais
Babin	Burgess	Diaz-Balart
Bacon	Calvert	Donalds
Baird	Cammack	Duncan
Balderson	Carey	Dunn
Banks	Carl	Ellzey
Barr	Carter (GA)	Emmer
Bentz	Carter (TX)	Estes
Bergman	Cawthorn	Fallon
Bice (OK)	Chabot	Feenstra
Biggs	Cheney	Ferguson
Bilirakis	Cline	Fischbach
Bishop (NC)	Cloud	Fitzgerald
Boebert	Clyde	Fitzpatrick
Bost	Cole	Fleischmann
Brooks	Comer	Foxx
Buchanan	Crawford	

Franklin, C.	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Scott	Kim (CA)	Rodgers (WA)
Fulcher	Kinzinger	Rogers (AL)
Gallagher	Kustoff	Rogers (KY)
Garbarino	LaHood	Rose
García (CA)	LaMalfa	Rosendale
Gibbs	Lamborn	Rouzer
Jimenez	Latta	Roy
Gohmert	LaTurner	Rutherford
Gonzales, Tony	Lesko	Salazar
Gonzalez (OH)	Letlow	Scalise
Good (VA)	Long	Schweikert
Gooden (TX)	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Gosar	Lucas	Sessions
Granger	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
Graves (LA)	Mace	Smith (MO)
Graves (MO)	Malliotakis	Smith (NE)
Green (TN)	Mann	Smith (NJ)
Greene (GA)	Massie	Smucker
Griffith	Mast	Spartz
Grothman	McCarthy	Stauber
Guthrie	McCaul	Steel
Harris	McClain	Stefanik
Harshbarger	McClintock	Steil
Hartzler	McHenry	Steube
Hern	McKinley	Stewart
Herrell	Meijer	Taylor
Herrera Beutler	Meuser	Tenney
Hice (GA)	Miller (WV)	Thompson (PA)
Higgins (LA)	Miller-Meeks	Tiffany
Hill	Moolenaar	Timmons
Hinson	Mooney	Turner
Hollingsworth	Moore (AL)	Upton
Hudson	Moore (UT)	Valadao
Huizenga	Mullin	Van Drew
Issa	Murphy (NC)	Van Duyn
Jackson	Nehls	Wagner
Jacobs (NY)	Newhouse	Walberg
Johnson (LA)	Norman	Waltz
Johnson (OH)	Obornolte	Weber (TX)
Johnson (SD)	Owens	Webster (FL)
Jordan	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Westerman
Joyce (PA)	Pence	Williams (TX)
Katko	Perry	Wittman
Keller	Posey	Womack
Kelly (MS)	Reschenthaler	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—12

Arrington	Clyburn	Pfleger
Brady	Crenshaw	Sewell
Casten	Guest	Walorski
Castor (FL)	Miller (IL)	Wilson (SC)

□ 1427

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Khanna (Watson)	Peters (Jeffries)
(Balderson)	Coleman	Pingree
Bustos (Mrvan)	Lamb (Blunt)	(Wasserman)
Carter (TX)	Rochester)	Schultz)
(Weber (TX))	Lawrence	Price (NC)
Correa (Huffman)	(Stevens)	(Manning)
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Rice (SC)
(Wasserman)	(Wasserman)	(Meijer)
Schultz)	Schultz)	Schneider
Davids (KS)	Lynch	(Stevens)
(Neguse)	(Langevin)	Speier (Huffman)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Mace (Carter (GA))	Stansbury (García (IL))
Evans (Beyer)	McEachin (Beyer)	Stanton
Gonzalez (OH)	Moore (WI)	(Huffman)
(Meijer)	(Beyer)	Suozzi (Beyer)
Johnson (GA)	Nadler (Pallone)	Taylor (Van Duyn)
(Manning)	Newman (Beyer)	Tenney
Johnson (TX)	O'Halleran	(Jackson)
(Jeffries)	(Schrader)	Titus (Pallone)
Kahele (Mrvan)	Palazzo	Waters (Takano)
Kelly (IL)	(Fleischmann)	Welch (Pallone)
(Neguse)	Payne (Pallone)	Wilson (FL)
		(Neguse)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Louisiana). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 204, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]

YEAS—218

Adams	Golden	O'Halleran
Aguilar	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Allred	Gonzalez,	Omar
Auchincloss	Vicente	Pallone
Axne	Gottheimer	Panetta
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Bass	Grijalva	Pascarella
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Payne
Bera	Hayes	Perlmutter
Beyer	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Phillips
Blumenauer	Horsford	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Houlihan	Pocan
Bonamici	Hoyer	Porter
Bourdeaux	Huffman	Pressley
Bowman	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Boyle, Brendan	Jacobs (CA)	Quigley
F.	Jayapal	Raskin
Brown (MD)	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Brown (OH)	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Brownley	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Bush	Jones	Ruiz
Bustos	Kahele	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Kaptur	Rush
Carbajal	Keating	Ryan
Cárdenas	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Carson	Khanna	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Kildee	Scanlon
Cartwright	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Case	Kim (NJ)	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kind	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cherfilus-	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
McCormick	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Chu	Lamb	Scott, David
Cicilline	Langevin	Sewell
Clark (MA)	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Cleaver	Lawrence	Sires
Clyburn	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Soto
Cooper	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Correa	Levin (CA)	Speier
Costa	Levin (MI)	Stansbury
Courtney	Lieu	Stanton
Craig	Lofgren	Stevens
Crist	Lowenthal	Strickland
Crow	Luria	Suozzi
Cuellar	Lynch	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	Malinowski	Takano
Davis, Danny K.	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Dean	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Maloney, Sean	Titus
DeGette	Manning	Tlaib
DeLauro	Matsui	Tonko
DelBene	McBath	Torres (CA)
Demings	McCollum	Torres (NY)
DeSaulnier	McEachin	Trahan
Deutch	McGovern	Trone
Dingell	McNerney	Underwood
Doggett	Meeks	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Meng	Veasey
F.	Mfume	Velázquez
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Wasserman
Eshoo	Morelle	Schultz
Espallat	Moulton	Waters
Evans	Mrvan	Watson Coleman
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Foster	Nadler	Wexton
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Wild
Galleo	Neal	Williams (GA)
Garamendi	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	Newman	Yarmuth
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	

NAYS—204

Aderholt	Baird	Biggs
Allen	Balderson	Billirakis
Amodei	Banks	Bishop (NC)
Armstrong	Barr	Boebert
Arrington	Bentz	Bost
Babin	Bergman	Brady
Bacon	Bice (OK)	Brooks

Buchanan	Grothman	Nehls
Buck	Guthrie	Newhouse
Bucshon	Harris	Norman
Budd	Harshbarger	Obornolte
Burchett	Hartzler	Owens
Burgess	Hern	Palazzo
Calvert	Herrell	Palmer
Cammack	Herrera Beutler	Pence
Carey	Hice (GA)	Perry
Carl	Higgins (LA)	Pfuger
Carter (GA)	Hill	Posey
Carter (TX)	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Cawthorn	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)
Chabot	Hudson	Rodgers (WA)
Cheney	Huizenga	Rogers (AL)
Cline	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Cloud	Jackson	Rose
Clyde	Jacobs (NY)	Rosendale
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Rouzer
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Roy
Crawford	Johnson (SD)	Rutherford
Crenshaw	Jordan	Salazar
Curtis	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Davidson	Joyce (PA)	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Sessions
DesJarlais	Keller	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Donalds	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Duncan	Kim (CA)	Smith (NJ)
Dunn	Kinzing	Smucker
Elizy	Kustoff	Spartz
Emmer	LaHood	Stauber
Estes	LaMalfa	Steel
Fallon	Lamborn	Stefanik
Feenstra	Latta	Steube
Ross	LaTurner	Stewart
Fischbach	Lesko	Taylor
Ruiz	Letlow	Tenney
Fitzgerald	Long	Thompson (PA)
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Tiffany
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Timmons
Fox	Mace	Turner
Franklin, C.	Scott	Upton
Fulcher	Malliotakis	Valadao
Gaetz	Mann	Van Drew
Gallagher	Massie	Van Dyne
Garbarino	Mast	Wagner
Garcia (CA)	McCarthy	Walberg
Gibbs	McCaul	Walorski
Gimenez	McClain	Waltz
Gohmert	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Gonzales, Tony	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Gonzalez (OH)	McKinley	Wenstrup
Good (VA)	Meijer	Westerman
Gooden (TX)	Meuser	Williams (TX)
Gosar	Miller (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Miller-Meeks	Wittman
Graves (LA)	Moolenaar	Womack
Graves (MO)	Mooney	Zeldin
Green (TN)	Moore (AL)	
Greene (GA)	Moore (UT)	
Griffith	Mullin	
	Murphy (NC)	

NOT VOTING—5

□ 1437

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Kelly (IL)	O'Halleran
(Balderson)	(Neguse)	(Schrader)
Bustos (Mrvan)	Khanna (Watson)	Palazzo
Carter (TX)	Coleman	(Fleischmann)
(Weber (TX))	Lamb (Blunt)	Payne (Pallone)
Correa (Huffman)	Rochester)	Peters (Jeffries)
Crist	Lawrence	Pingree
(Wasserman	(Stevens)	(Wasserman
Schultz)	Lawson (FL)	Schultz)
Davids (KS)	(Wasserman	Price (NC)
(Neguse)	Schultz)	(Manning)
Deutch (Rice	Lynch	Rice (SC)
(NY))	(Langevin)	(Meijer)
Evans (Beyer)	Mace (Carter	Schneider
Gonzalez (OH)	(GA)	(Stevens)
(Meijer)	McEachin	Speier (Huffman)
Johnson (GA)	(Beyer)	Stansbury
(Manning)	Moore (WI)	(Garcia (IL))
Johnson (TX)	(Beyer)	Stanton
(Jeffries)	Nadler (Pallone)	(Huffman)
Kahele (Mrvan)	Newman (Beyer)	Suozzi (Beyer)

Taylor (Van	Walorski	Wilson (FL)
Duynne)	(Bucshon)	(Neguse)
Tenney	Waters (Takano)	Wilson (SC)
(Jackson)	Welch (Pallone)	(Timmons)
Titus (Pallone)		

SUPREME COURT POLICE PARITY ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 4160) to amend title 40, United States Code, to grant the Supreme Court of the United States security-related authorities equivalent to the legislative and executive branches, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LIEU) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 27, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

YEAS—396

Adams	Castor (FL)	Fischbach
Aderholt	Castro (TX)	Fitzgerald
Aguilar	Cawthorn	Fitzpatrick
Allen	Chabot	Fleischmann
Allred	Cheney	Fletcher
Amodei	Cherfilus-	Foster
Armstrong	McCormick	Fox
Arrington	Chu	Frankel, Lois
Auchincloss	Cicilline	Franklin, C.
Axne	Clark (MA)	Scott
Babin	Clarke (NY)	Fulcher
Bacon	Cleaver	Gaetz
Baird	Cline	Gallagher
Balderson	Cloud	Galleo
Banks	Clyburn	Garamendi
Barr	Clyde	Garbarino
Barragán	Cohen	Garcia (CA)
Bass	Cole	Gibbs
Bentz	Comer	Gimenez
Bera	Connolly	Gohmert
Bergman	Cooper	Golden
Beyer	Correa	Gomez
Bice (OK)	Costa	Gonzales, Tony
Biggs	Courtney	Gonzalez (OH)
Billirakis	Craig	Gonzalez,
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Vicente
Bishop (NC)	Crenshaw	Good (VA)
Blumenauer	Crist	Gooden (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Crow	Gosar
Boebert	Cuellar	Granger
Bonamici	Curtis	Graves (LA)
Bost	Davids (KS)	Graves (MO)
Bourdeaux	Davidson	Green (TN)
Boyle, Brendan	Davis, Danny K.	Green, Al (TX)
F.	Davis, Rodney	Greene (GA)
Brady	Dean	Griffith
Brooks	DeFazio	Grothman
Brown (MD)	DeGette	Guthrie
Brown (OH)	DeLauro	Harder (CA)
Brownley	DelBene	Harris
Buchanan	Demings	Harshbarger
Buck	DeSaulnier	Hartzler
Bucshon	DesJarlais	Hayes
Budd	Deutch	Hern
Burchett	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Burgess	Dingell	Higgins (LA)
Bustos	Doggett	Higgins (NY)
Butterfield	Donalds	Hill
Calvert	Doyle, Michael	Himes
Cammack	F.	Hinson
Carbajal	Duncan	Hollingsworth
Cárdenas	Dunn	Houlihan
Carey	Ellzey	Hoyer
Carl	Emmer	Hudson
Carson	Eshoo	Huffman
Carter (GA)	Estes	Huizenga
Carter (LA)	Evans	Issa
Carter (TX)	Fallon	Jackson
Cartwright	Feenstra	Jackson Lee
Case	Ferguson	

Jacobs (CA) McKinley
 Jacobs (NY) McMerney
 Jeffries Meeks
 Johnson (GA) Meijer
 Johnson (LA) Meng
 Johnson (OH) Meuser
 Johnson (SD) Mfume
 Johnson (TX) Miller (WV)
 Jones Miller-Meeks
 Jordan Moolenaar
 Joyce (OH) Mooney
 Joyce (PA) Moore (AL)
 Kahele Moore (UT)
 Kaptur Moore (WI)
 Katko Morelle
 Keating Moulton
 Keller Mrvan
 Kelly (IL) Mullin
 Kelly (MS) Murphy (FL)
 Kelly (PA) Murphy (NC)
 Khanna Nadler
 Kildee Napolitano
 Kilmer Neal
 Kim (CA) Neguse
 Kim (NJ) Nehls
 Kind Newhouse
 Kinzinger Norcross
 Kirkpatrick Norman
 Krishnamoorthi O'Halleran
 Kuster Obernolte
 Kustoff Omar
 LaHood Owens
 LaMalfa Palazzo
 Lamb Pallone
 Lamborn Palmer
 Langevin Panetta
 Larsen (WA) Pappas
 Larson (CT) Pence
 Latta Perry
 LaTurner Peters
 Lawson (FL) Plunger
 Lee (NV) Phillips
 Leger Fernandez Pingree
 Lesko Pocan
 Letlow Porter
 Levin (CA) Posey
 Levin (MI) Price (NC)
 Lieu Quigley
 Lofgren Raskin
 Long Reschenthaler
 Loudermilk Rice (NY)
 Lowenthal Rice (SC)
 Lucas Rodgers (WA)
 Luetkemeyer Rogers (AL)
 Luria Rogers (KY)
 Lynch Rose
 Mace Rosendale
 Malliotakis Ross
 Maloney, Carolyn B. Rouzer
 Maloney, Sean Roy
 Mann Roybal-Allard
 Manning Ruiz
 Massie Ruppertsberger
 Mast Rush
 Matsui Rutherford
 McBeth Ryan
 McCarthy Salazar
 McCaul Sarbanes
 McClain Scalise
 McClintock Scanlon
 McCollum Schakowsky
 McEachin Schiff
 McGovern Schneider
 McHenry Schrader

NAYS—27

Beatty Horsford
 Bowman Jayapal
 Bush Lawrence
 Escobar Lee (CA)
 Espallat Malinowski
 Garcia (IL) Newman
 Garcia (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
 Gotthelmer Pascrell
 Grijalva Payne

NOT VOTING—4

Casten Herrell
 Guest Miller (IL)

□ 1449

Mses. LEE of California and NEWMAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 259, “nay” on rollcall No. 260, and “yea” on rollcall No. 261.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE

RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Lamb (Blunt)	Price (NC)
(Balderson)	Rochester	(Manning)
Bustos (Mrvan)	Lawrence	Rice (SC)
Carter (TX)	(Stevens)	(Meijer)
(Weber (TX))	Lawson (FL)	Schneider
Correa (Huffman)	(Wasserman)	(Stevens)
Crist	Schultz	Speier (Huffman)
(Wasserman)	Lynch	Stansbury
Schultz	(Langevin)	(Garcia (IL))
Davidson (KS)	Mace (Carter)	Stanton
(Neguse)	(GA)	(Huffman)
Deutch (Rice)	McEachin	Suozi (Beyer)
(NY)	(Beyer)	Taylor (Van)
Evans (Beyer)	Moore (WI)	Duynne
Gonzalez (OH)	(Beyer)	Tenney
(Meijer)	Nadler (Pallone)	(Jackson)
Johnson (GA)	Newman (Beyer)	Titus (Pallone)
(Manning)	O'Halleran	Walorski
Johnson (TX)	(Schrader)	(Buchson)
(Jeffries)	Palazzo	Waters (Takano)
Kahele (Mrvan)	(Fleischmann)	Welch (Pallone)
Kelly (IL)	Payne (Pallone)	Wilson (FL)
(Neguse)	Peters (Jeffries)	(Neguse)
Khanna (Watson)	Pingree	Wilson (SC)
Coleman	(Wasserman)	(Timmons)
	Schultz	

RECOVERING AMERICA'S
WILDLIFE ACT OF 2021

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1170, I call up the bill (H.R. 2773) to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to make supplemental funds available for management of fish and wildlife species of greatest conservation need as determined by State fish and wildlife agencies, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-47, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 117-366, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 2773

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Recovering America’s Wildlife Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to extend financial and technical assistance to States, territories, the District of Columbia, and Indian Tribes, including under the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), for the purpose of avoiding the need to list species, or recovering species currently listed as a threatened species or an endangered species, under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or under State law.

TITLE I—WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

SEC. 101. WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION SUBACCOUNT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b) is amended in subsection (c)—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (9) and (10); and

(2) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBACCOUNT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the fund a subaccount to be known as the ‘Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Subaccount’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Subaccount’).

“(B) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts in the Subaccount shall be available without further appropriation, for each fiscal year, for apportionment in accordance with this Act.

“(C) DEPOSITS INTO SUBACCOUNT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the general fund of the Treasury to the Subaccount—

“(i) for fiscal year 2023, \$850,000,000;

“(ii) for fiscal year 2024, \$1,100,000,000;

“(iii) for fiscal year 2025, \$1,200,000,000; and

“(iv) for fiscal year 2026 and each fiscal year thereafter, \$1,300,000,000.

“(2) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts transferred to the Subaccount shall supplement, but not replace, existing funds available to the States from—

“(A) the funds distributed pursuant to the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777 et seq.); and

“(B) the fund.

“(3) INNOVATION GRANTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall distribute 10 percent of funds apportioned from the Subaccount through a competitive grant program to State fish and wildlife departments, the District of Columbia fish and wildlife department, fish and wildlife departments of territories, or to regional associations of fish and wildlife departments (or any group composed of more than 1 such entity).

“(B) PURPOSE.—Such grants shall be provided for the purpose of catalyzing innovation of techniques, tools, strategies, or collaborative partnerships that accelerate, expand, or replicate effective and measurable recovery efforts for species of greatest conservation need and species listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and the habitats of such species.

“(C) REVIEW COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall appoint a review committee comprised of—

“(i) a State Director from each regional association of State fish and wildlife departments;

“(ii) the head of a department responsible for fish and wildlife management in a territory;

“(iii) one delegate from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, for the purpose of providing technical assistance; and

“(iv) beginning in fiscal year 2023, four individuals representing four different nonprofit organizations each of which is actively participating in carrying out wildlife conservation restoration activities using funds apportioned from the Subaccount.

“(D) SUPPORT FROM UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.—Using not more than 3 percent of the amounts apportioned under subparagraph (A) to carry out a competitive grant program, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall provide any personnel or administrative support services necessary for such committee to carry out its responsibilities under this Act.

“(E) EVALUATION.—Such committee shall evaluate each proposal submitted under this paragraph and recommend projects for funding, giving preference to solutions that accelerate the recovery of species identified as priorities through regional scientific assessments of species of greatest conservation need.

“(4) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds apportioned from the Subaccount shall be used for purposes consistent with section 2 of the Recovering America’s Wildlife Act of 2022 and—

“(A) shall be used to implement the Wildlife Conservation Strategy of a State, territory, or the District of Columbia, as required under section 4(e), by carrying out, revising, or enhancing existing wildlife and habitat conservation and restoration programs and developing and implementing new wildlife conservation and restoration programs to recover and manage species of greatest conservation need and the key habitats and plant community types essential to the conservation of those species, as determined by the appropriate State fish and wildlife department;

“(B) shall be used to develop, revise, and enhance the Wildlife Conservation Strategy of a State, territory, or the District of Columbia, as may be required by this Act;

“(C) shall be used to assist in the recovery of species found in the State, territory, or the District of Columbia that are listed as endangered species, threatened species, candidate species or species proposed for listing, or species petitioned for listing under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or under State law;

“(D) may be used for wildlife conservation education and wildlife-associated recreation projects, especially in historically underserved communities;

“(E) may be used to manage a species of greatest conservation need whose range is shared with another State, territory, Indian Tribe, or foreign government and for the conservation of the habitat of such species;

“(F) may be used to manage, control, and prevent invasive species, disease, and other risks to species of greatest conservation need; and

“(G) may be used for law enforcement activities that are directly related to the protection and conservation of a species of greatest conservation need and the habitat of such species.

“(5) MINIMUM REQUIRED SPENDING FOR ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY.—Not less than an average of 15 percent over a 5-year period of amounts apportioned to a State, territory, or the District of Columbia from the Subaccount shall be used for purposes described in paragraph (4)(C). The Secretary may reduce the minimum requirement of a State, territory, or the District of Columbia on an annual basis if the Secretary determines that the State, territory, or the District of Columbia is meeting the conservation and recovery needs of all species described in paragraph (4)(C).

“(6) PUBLIC ACCESS TO PRIVATE LANDS NOT REQUIRED.—Funds apportioned from the Subaccount shall not be conditioned upon the provision of public access to private lands, waters, or holdings.

“(7) REQUIREMENTS FOR MATCHING FUNDS.—

“(A) For the purposes of the non-Federal fund matching requirement for a wildlife conservation or restoration program or project funded by the Subaccount, a State, territory, or the District of Columbia may use as matching non-Federal funds—

“(i) funds from Federal agencies other than the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture;

“(ii) donated private lands and waters, including privately owned easements;

“(iii) in circumstances described in subparagraph (B), revenue generated through the sale of State hunting and fishing licenses; and

“(iv) other sources consistent with part 80 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, in effect on the date of enactment of the Recovering America’s Wildlife Act of 2022.

“(B) Revenue described in subparagraph (A)(iii) may only be used to fulfill the requirements of such non-Federal fund matching requirement if—

“(i) no Federal funds apportioned to the State fish and wildlife department of such State from the Wildlife Restoration Program or the Sport

Fish Restoration Program have been reverted because of a failure to fulfill such non-Federal fund matching requirement by such State during the previous 2 years; and

“(ii) the project or program being funded benefits the habitat of a hunted or fished species and a species of greatest conservation need.

“(8) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the following definitions apply:

“(A) PARTNERSHIPS.—The term ‘partnerships’ may include collaborative efforts with Federal agencies, State agencies, local agencies, Indian Tribes, nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, industry groups, and private individuals to implement a State’s Wildlife Conservation Strategy.

“(B) SPECIES OF GREATEST CONSERVATION NEED.—The term ‘species of greatest conservation need’ may be fauna or flora, and may include terrestrial, aquatic, marine, and invertebrate species that are of low population, declining, rare, or facing threats and in need of conservation attention, as determined by each State fish and wildlife department, with respect to funds apportioned to such State.

“(C) TERRITORY AND TERRITORIES.—The terms ‘territory’ and ‘territories’ mean the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

“(D) WILDLIFE.—The term ‘wildlife’ means any species of wild, freeranging fauna, including fish, and also fauna in captive breeding programs the object of which is to reintroduce individuals of a depleted indigenous species into previously occupied range.”.

(b) Section 3 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior ½ of 1 percent of the amounts made available under subsection (c) for the purposes of providing oversight and accountability with respect to expenditure of funds authorized under such subsection, to remain available until September 30, 2029.”.

(c) ALLOCATION AND APPORTIONMENT OF AVAILABLE AMOUNTS.—Section 4 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “to the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each” and inserting “To the District of Columbia”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “to Guam” and inserting “To Guam”; and

(II) by striking “not more than one-fourth of one percent” and inserting “not less than one-third of one percent”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) To the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a sum equal to not less than 1 percent thereof.”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

“(i) one-half of which is based on the ratio to which the land and water area of such State bears to the total land and water area of all such States;”;

(ii) in clause (ii)—

(I) by striking “two-thirds” and inserting “one-quarter”; and

(II) by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) one-quarter of which is based upon the ratio to which the number of species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) in such State bears to the total number of such species listed in all such States.”;

(C) by amending paragraph (2)(B) to read as follows:

“(B) The amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no such State, unless otherwise designated, shall be apportioned a sum which is less than 1 percent or more than 5 percent of the amount available for apportionment under—

“(i) subparagraph (A)(i);

“(ii) subparagraph (A)(ii); and

“(iii) the overall amount available for subparagraph (A).”; and

(D) in paragraph (3), by striking “3 percent” and inserting “1.85 percent”;

(2) in subsection (e)(4)—

(A) by amending subparagraph (B) to read as follows:

“(B) Not more than an average of 15 percent over a 5-year period of amounts apportioned to each State, territory, or the District of Columbia under this section for a wildlife conservation and restoration program may be used for wildlife conservation education and wildlife-associated recreation.”; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B), as so amended, the following:

“(C) 5 percent of amounts apportioned to each State, each territory, or the District of Columbia under this section for a wildlife conservation and restoration program shall be reserved for States and territories that include plants among their species of greatest conservation need and in the conservation planning and habitat prioritization efforts of their Wildlife Conservation Strategy. Each eligible State, territory, or the District of Columbia shall receive an additional 5 percent of their apportioned amount. Any unallocated resources shall be allocated proportionally among all States and territories under the formulas of this section.”; and

(3) by adding at the end following:

“(f) MINIMIZATION OF PLANNING AND REPORTING.—Nothing in this Act shall be interpreted to require a State to create a comprehensive strategy related to conservation education or outdoor recreation.

“(g) ACCOUNTABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not more than one year after the date of enactment of the Recovering America’s Wildlife Act of 2022 and every 3 years thereafter, each State fish and wildlife department shall submit a 3-year work plan and budget for implementing its Wildlife Conservation Strategy and a report describing the results derived from activities accomplished under subsection (e) during the previous 3 years to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for review, which shall summarize such findings and submit a report to—

“(A) the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The format of the 3-year work plans, budgets, and reports required under paragraph (1) shall be established by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in consultation with the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.

“(3) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 7 years after the date of enactment of the Recovering America’s Wildlife Act of 2022, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to examine the progress of States, territories, the District of Columbia, and Indian Tribes towards achieving the purpose described in section 2 of that Act.”.

SEC. 102. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking “including fish,”; and

(2) in paragraph (9), by inserting “Indian Tribes, academic institutions,” before “wildlife conservation organizations”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3—
 (A) in subsection (a)—
 (i) by striking “(1) An amount equal to” and inserting “An amount equal to”; and
 (ii) by striking paragraph (2);
 (B) in subsection (c)—
 (i) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by section 101(a)(1), by striking “or an Indian tribe”; and
 (ii) in paragraph (10), as redesignated by section 101(a)(1), by striking “Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account” and inserting “Subaccount”; and
 (C) in subsection (d), by striking “Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account” and inserting “Subaccount”;
 (2) in section 4 (16 U.S.C. 669c)—
 (A) in subsection (d)—
 (i) in the heading, by striking “ACCOUNT” and inserting “SUBACCOUNT”; and
 (ii) by striking “Account” each place it appears and inserting “Subaccount”; and
 (B) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “Account” and inserting “Subaccount”; and
 (3) in section 8 (16 U.S.C. 669g), in subsection (a), by striking “Account” and inserting “Subaccount”.

SEC. 103. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

The Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 14 as section 16; and

(2) by inserting after section 13 the following:

“SEC. 14. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

“Nothing in this Act shall be construed to enlarge or diminish the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of a State to manage, control, or regulate fish and wildlife under the law and regulations of the State on lands and waters within the State, including on Federal lands and waters.

“SEC. 15. STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO ALASKA.

“If any conflict arises between any provision of this Act and any provision of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) or the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), then the provision in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act or the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act shall prevail.”.

TITLE II—TRIBAL WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

SEC. 201. INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ACCOUNT.—The term “Account” means the Tribal Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account established by subsection (b)(1).

(2) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian Tribe” has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) TRIBAL SPECIES OF GREATEST CONSERVATION NEED.—The term “Tribal species of greatest conservation need” means any species identified by an Indian Tribe as requiring conservation management because of declining population, habitat loss, or other threats, or because of their biological or cultural importance to such Tribe.

(5) WILDLIFE.—The term “wildlife” means—
 (A) any species of wild flora or fauna including fish and marine mammals;

(B) flora or fauna in a captive breeding, rehabilitation, and holding or quarantine program, the object of which is to reintroduce individuals of a depleted indigenous species into previously occupied range or to maintain a species for conservation purposes; and

(C) does not include game farm animals.

(b) TRIBAL WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION ACCOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury an account to be known as the “Tribal Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account”.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts in the Account shall be available for each fiscal year without further appropriation for apportionment in accordance with this title.

(3) DEPOSITS INTO ACCOUNT.—

Beginning in fiscal year 2023, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer \$97,500,000 from the general fund of the Treasury to the Account.

(c) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO INDIAN TRIBES.—Each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Treasury shall deposit funds into the Account and distribute such funds through a non-competitive application process according to guidelines and criteria, and reporting requirements determined by the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in consultation with Indian Tribes. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

(d) WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES.—The distribution guidelines and criteria described in subsection (c) shall be based, in part, upon an Indian Tribe’s wildlife management responsibilities. Any funding allocated to an Indian Tribe in Alaska may only be used in a manner consistent with the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.), and Public Law 85–508 (commonly known as the “Alaska Statehood Act”) (48 U.S.C. note prec. 21). Alaska Native Corporations or Tribes may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Alaska on conservation projects of mutual concern.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary may distribute funds from the Account to an Indian Tribe for any of the following purposes:

(A) To develop, carry out, revise, or enhance wildlife conservation and restoration programs to manage Tribal species of greatest conservation need and the habitats of such species, as determined by the Indian Tribe.

(B) To assist in the recovery of species listed as an endangered or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(C) For wildlife conservation education and wildlife-associated recreation projects.

(D) To manage a Tribal species of greatest conservation need and the habitat of such species, the range of which may be shared with a foreign country, State, or other Indian Tribe.

(E) To manage, control, and prevent invasive species as well as diseases and other risks to wildlife.

(F) For law enforcement activities that are directly related to the protection and conservation of wildlife.

(G) To develop, revise, and implement comprehensive wildlife conservation strategies and plans for such Tribe.

(H) For the hiring and training of wildlife conservation and restoration program staff.

(2) CONDITIONS ON THE USE OF FUNDS.—

(A) REQUIRED USE OF FUNDS.—In order to be eligible to receive funds under subsection (c), a Tribe’s application must include a proposal to use funds for at least one of the purposes described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(B) IMPERILED SPECIES RECOVERY.—In distributing funds under this section, the Secretary shall distribute not less than 15 percent of the total funds distributed to proposals to fund the recovery of a species, subspecies, or distinct population segment listed as a threatened species, endangered species, or candidate species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or Tribal law.

(C) LIMITATION.—In distributing funds under this section, the Secretary shall distribute not more than 15 percent of all funds distributed under this section for the purpose described in paragraph (1)(C).

(f) NO MATCHING FUNDS REQUIRED.—No Indian Tribe shall be required to provide matching

funds to be eligible to receive funds under this Act.

(g) PUBLIC ACCESS NOT REQUIRED.—Funds apportioned from the Tribal Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account shall not be conditioned upon the provision of public or non-Tribal access to Tribal or private lands, waters, or holdings.

(h) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Of the funds deposited under subsection (b)(3) for each fiscal year, not more than 3 percent shall be used by the Secretary for administrative costs.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior ½ of 1 percent of the amounts made available this section for the purposes of providing oversight and accountability with respect to expenditure of funds authorized under this section, to remain available until September 30, 2029.

(j) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as modifying or abrogating a treaty with any Indian Tribe, or as enlarging or diminishing the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of an Indian Tribe to manage, control, or regulate wildlife.

(k) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO ALASKA.—If any conflict arises between any provision of this Act and any provision of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3101 et seq.) or the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), then the provision in the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act or the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act shall prevail.

TITLE III—ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY AND HABITAT CONSERVATION LEGACY FUND

SEC. 301. ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY AND HABITAT CONSERVATION LEGACY FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the “Endangered Species Recovery and Habitat Conservation Legacy Fund” (referred to in this section as the “Fund”).

(b) FUNDING.—For each of fiscal years 2023 through 2026, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer from the general fund of the Treasury to the Fund \$187,500,000.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”), as provided in subsection (e), without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation.

(d) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest any portion of the Fund that is not, as determined by the Secretary, required to meet the current needs of the Fund.

(2) REQUIREMENT.—An investment requested under paragraph (1) shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a public debt security—

(A) with a maturity suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary; and

(B) bearing interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

(3) CREDITS TO FUND.—The income on investments of the Fund under this subsection shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Fund shall be used for recovering the species managed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, as follows:

(1) ENDANGERED SPECIES RECOVERY GRANT PROGRAM.—\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2026, to remain available until expended, shall be used to establish and implement

a grant and technical assistance program, to be known as the "Endangered Species Recovery Grant Program", to provide competitive matching grants for the purpose of recovering species listed as a threatened species or an endangered species under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) by addressing the backlog in the development of recovery plans, and implementing the backlog of activities identified in existing recovery plans, under subsection (f) of that section (16 U.S.C. 1533(f)). The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation to establish and cooperatively manage the Endangered Species Recovery Grant Program in accordance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) and the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(2) INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION RESPONSIBILITIES.—\$75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2026, to remain available until expended, shall be used for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to address interagency consultation responsibilities under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536).

(3) CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES.—\$28,125,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2026, to remain available until expended, shall be used for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to work with non-Federal entities, including through, but not limited to, the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, the Coastal Program, and the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.).—

(A) to conserve at risk species, species that are candidates or proposed for listing, and species that are listed as threatened or endangered species under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533), including through rescue and rehabilitation efforts; and

(B) to conserve wildlife habitat.

(4) VOLUNTARY CONSERVATION AGREEMENTS.—\$9,375,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2026, to remain available until expended, shall be used for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to address the development and permitting of voluntary conservation agreements under section 10 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1539).

(f) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available under this section shall supplement and not supplant any other Federal amounts made available to carry out activities described in this section in an annual appropriations Act of Congress.

(g) SUBMISSION OF SPECIES LISTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) PRIORITY LIST OF SPECIES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, shall submit to the Committees on Environment and Public Works and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a list of threatened species and endangered species for which recovery plans described in subsection (e)(1) will be developed or implemented for fiscal year 2023.

(2) ANNUAL LIST OF SPECIES.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States, a list of threatened species and endangered species for which recovery plans described in subsection (e)(1) will be developed or implemented with amounts from the Fund.

(h) PUBLIC DONATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may accept public cash donations that advance efforts—

(A) to address the backlog in the development and implementation of recovery plans; and

(B) to encourage relevant public-private partnerships.

(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Any cash donations accepted under paragraph (1) shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

(3) REJECTION OF DONATIONS.—The Secretary may reject a donation under this section when

the rejection is in the interest of the Federal Government, as determined by the Secretary.

(i) ALLOCATION AUTHORITY.—

(1) SUBMISSION OF COST ESTIMATES.—The President shall submit to Congress detailed allocations by program element of the amount recommended for allocation in a fiscal year from amounts made available under subsection (c), consistent with the use of funds under subsection (e), as follows:

(A) For fiscal year 2023, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) For each fiscal year thereafter, until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are allocated, as part of the annual budget submission of the President under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code.

(2) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives may provide for alternate allocation of amounts recommended for allocation in a given fiscal year from amounts made available under subsection (c), consistent with the use of funds under subsection (e), including allocations by program element.

(B) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

(i) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations, including by program, by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, only then shall amounts recommended for allocation for that fiscal year from amounts made available under subsection (c), consistent with the use of funds under subsection (e), be allocated by the President or apportioned or allotted by program pursuant to title 31, United States Code.

(ii) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations, including by program, for amounts recommended for allocation in a given fiscal year from amounts made available under subsection (c), consistent with the use of funds under subsection (e), that are less than the full amount recommended for allocation for that fiscal year, the difference between the amount recommended for allocation and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President and apportioned and allotted by program pursuant to title 31, United States Code.

(j) PROHIBITIONS.—No amounts from the Fund shall be used—

(1) to make any listing determination relating to the endangered or threatened status of any species pursuant to section 4(a) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(a));

(2) on any experimental population (as defined in paragraph (1) of section 10(j) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1539(j))) of a threatened or endangered species that is determined to be nonessential under that section;

(3) outside of the United States (as defined in section 3 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1532)); and

(4) to acquire any Federal land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, is debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2773.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2773, the Recovering America's Wildlife Act. This legislation has been years in the making, and this moment is the culmination of the collected works of a bipartisan group of Members, a strong, diverse coalition of advocates, and grassroots support from across the country.

This work began in 2015 when the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies—which represents State fish and wildlife agencies across the country—established a blue ribbon panel on sustaining America's diverse fish and wildlife resources.

After working closely with hunting and fishing organizations, as well as partners in the sportsmen's community, businesses, and other advocates, it was decided that we needed a 21st century model of funding conservation to address the current shortfalls in wildlife conservation.

Right now, the United States is facing an unprecedented biodiversity crisis. One-third of all bird species are in need of urgent conservation action. In fact, the number of birds in the United States and Canada have fallen by 29 percent since 1970; a decline of almost 3 billion fewer birds.

We have seen similar declines across the board. For example, 40 percent of freshwater fish species are also at risk. One-third of all U.S. wildlife species are currently imperiled or vulnerable.

These developments threaten our common environmental heritage, reduce opportunities for outdoor recreation, and will require costly and aggressive interventions if not addressed soon.

This legislation is particularly critical for the sportsmen's community. As one of the co-chairs of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I have always said that sportsmen and women are some of our best conservation advocates, as they understand the on-the-ground reality of the decline in wildlife and the importance of cost-effective conservation.

Their input has been critical to the historic and innovative legislation before us today. Without a change in the way we finance fish and wildlife conservation, the list of Federally threatened and endangered species will balloon from nearly 1,600 species today to thousands more in the future.

□ 1500

The cost of inaction is immense. The longer we wait to address this issue, the more resources we will ultimately need to safeguard our Nation's wildlife and environment. And we cannot keep waiting. We must take the bold, urgent action that addresses the scale of the threat. We need strong, proactive conservation measures to address these

unmet needs, and that is why the Recovering America's Wildlife Act is necessary.

The legislation provides approximately \$1.4 billion in dedicated, annual funding to the States, territories, and Native American Tribes for proactive conservation efforts for the approximately 12,000 species of wildlife and plants identified under State wildlife action plans.

This bold investment in our Nation's wildlife will pay significant dividends. It will allow States to take proactive action that will prevent at-risk species from becoming endangered. This is critical not only to preserving our common environmental heritage, but for supporting hunters, anglers, and the almost \$900 billion outdoor recreation economy.

As I have said previously, as one of the co-chairs of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, I understand the importance of these measures to support fishermen and hunters across the country.

I thank my three fellow co-chairs of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus who have sponsored the Recovering America's Wildlife Act as well. It shows the strong, bipartisan support for this bill.

The broad group of stakeholders supporting the Recovering America's Wildlife Act underscores the need for action and the support for this approach. Hundreds of leading sportsmen's groups, hunting and fishing advocates across the country, conservation organizations, environmental organizations, and businesses, all support the legislation for good reason: it utilizes proven funding mechanisms, boldly addresses pressing conservation needs, and prevents the need for more costly interventions in the future.

The Recovering America's Wildlife Act is the product of years and years of work and consultation with these stakeholders and has broad bipartisan support. This legislation has received bipartisan support in both the House and Senate, and the thoughtful input of my colleagues has resulted in strong consensus legislation that will benefit every single congressional district in the country.

We have a conservation, economic, and moral rationale to act in order to protect and recover America's wildlife for future generations. This is an opportunity to take historic action to address a pressing conservation need, and I ask my colleagues that they support the Recovering America's Wildlife Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in reluctant opposition to H.R. 2773, as drafted. The goal of this bill is commendable. Republicans and Democrats alike want to see America's wildlife thrive. Unfortunately, the legislation as written contains partisan provisions that I simply cannot support.

State and Tribal fish and wildlife agencies have long been recognized as the primary and most well-equipped managers of local species and habitat in the United States. After all, those on the ground are more attuned to what is happening in their backyards than the Federal Government. That is why State and Tribal wildlife agencies, as well as prominent sportsmen's groups support this bill.

While the bill would provide financial resources to States and Tribes to help meet wildlife recovery goals, the spending is mandatory and lacks any offset. This spending is not pocket change. The Congressional Budget Office estimated the Rules Committee Print would lead to more than \$12 billion—that is \$12 billion—in direct spending in the first decade of the program alone. And I say the first decade, because that is only what is in the so-called scoring window. In reality, this program and its mandatory spending would last forever since there is no sunset in titles I and II of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the modern-day funding models suggested by the blue ribbon commission. This is an important issue, and we should make the responsible, tough decisions on how to fund it.

This funding model has no offset ever, and it has an average expenditure of \$1.4 billion per year. It is the most irresponsible, lazy way to fund the program, especially with the record government spending that is contributing to record inflation. At a time of rampant inflation, it would be wildly irresponsible to drive inflation even higher and saddle future generations with the consequences. The debt created by this bill will only add to our Nation's current \$30 trillion debt.

This bill also lacks a sunset provision. Without a sunset, there is no mechanism to ensure oversight or proper review of the program to fix flaws that may arise. Mandating a permanent new program is poor governance, and it ignores precedent. Congress routinely passes legislation like the Farm Bill or the Water Resources Development Act which have proper sunsets. Those sunsets require us to come back and do our jobs by assessing what is working, what is not working, and making tweaks and changes to the law.

The bill does not allow Congress the opportunity to perform the needed oversight. Instead, it requires spending \$1.4 billion per year in perpetuity. I, and my fellow Republican committee members, tried to resolve these fiscal issues with amendments at the committee markup. We were told by the Democrat majority that, although they opposed these amendments at the time, they would work with us on finding a funding offset before this bill would be considered on the floor.

We stayed at the negotiating table, as did the bill's sponsor, Mrs. DINGELL, whom I have a lot of respect for and commend her for her efforts on this

bill. But larger forces decided to ram this bill forward without fixing anything. In fact, the majority made the bill worse than it was when it left our committee.

They decided to airdrop provisions into a new title III that would siphon money away from States and Tribes and give it to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. That is in direct contrast to the spirit of this bill to give money to the State and Tribal agencies so that they could do the management.

We never even had the chance to debate this terrible title in the committee. The whole point of this bill was to empower States and Tribes who are the ones, again, who are closest to our lands and waters, not to increase the Washington, D.C., Federal bureaucracy, which is now what this bill will do.

A number of Republican amendments proposed to the Rules Committee tried to fix these problems and several other issues but they were similarly ignored, depriving us of ways to improve the bill and debate these issues today. As a result of all of this, we have a regrettably flawed bill. The situation we are now in was avoidable. The bill before us represents a lost opportunity to forge significant bipartisan compromise. It didn't have to be this way, and I hope that this is not a partisan sign of the future of conservation.

I will remain at the table and hope that my Democratic colleagues come back and work together with us on a lasting solution. Until then, I am opposed to H.R. 2773, and I reluctantly encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's perspective on permanent funding, and I have a great deal of respect for him. We have and will always continue to work together on conservation issues. But the fact is we know that stable and predictable funding is critical to effective conservation efforts, and that is what the blue ribbon panel on sustaining America's diverse fish and wildlife resources—which included 26 members from the hunting and fishing business and outdoor recreation communities—found in their 2016 report whose recommendations formed the basis of this legislation. We have seen that this funding structure has been fundamental to the success of Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson conservation programs upon which this is built.

I appreciate my colleague's views on oversight. This legislation contains robust guardrails to ensure that there is appropriate use of public funds, including reporting requirements and other oversight provisions.

So the Recovering America's Wildlife Act does meet the moment because of its funding structure and because of the strong oversight language which is

supported by the coalitions of hundreds of organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative DINGELL for the time and for her great work on this landmark bipartisan legislation, the Recovering America's Wildlife Act, or RAWA, as we call it.

This is a bright spot amidst so many problems facing our Nation. As our constituents are well aware, the climate crisis and other human impacts have dramatically harmed our Nation's wildlife, and, in fact, State agencies have identified 12,000 wildlife species that are in need of conservation assistance. In the United States alone, there are currently 1,300 species that are either threatened or endangered. If we fail to act, these profound and irreversible losses will continue to have devastating ecosystem impacts.

States, territories, and Tribes are doing great work to address threats to wildlife, but their conservation efforts have been chronically underfunded for decades. This stream of dedicated funding from RAWA is a lifeline for local wildlife agencies.

This bill also provides local governments the resources to address key elements impacting biodiversity loss such as wildfire and drought which are worsening as the climate crisis accelerates. RAWA lays the groundwork for wildfire threat mitigation on a number of fronts, including managing vegetation and creating wildlife-friendly fire management plans on the front end, performing emergency rescues during the fires, and restoring critical habitat after fires.

RAWA funding will also allow local communities to restore habitats that have been harmed by drought and protect vulnerable ecosystems from further damage because we know these drought conditions are going to continue.

We cannot lose sight of the cultural implications of this legislation. The funding in this bill for Tribal nations to recover fish and wildlife is critical to protecting the species that have been integral to their cultures since time immemorial. Biodiversity is declining at a rate not seen since the last mass extinction. Tackling this crisis simply cannot wait.

As chairman of the Water, Oceans, and Wildlife Subcommittee of the House Natural Resources Committee, I am incredibly glad to see this bill on the floor today with strong bipartisan support—42 Republican cosponsors, and 152 Democrats.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will point out that even though there is a reporting requirement in the legislation, once you approve mandatory, permanent spending, then Congress loses our leverage. Creating a permanent program doesn't bode well for

oversight from Congress. Programs that were mentioned like Pittman-Robinson, think about the land and water conservation fund, all of those had dedicated funding streams. This funding is coming straight out of the Treasury. It is coming out of our kids' and our grandkids' piggy banks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ).

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article from Claremont Review of Books, spring, 2022, titled "In the Red," by Jeffrey H. Anderson.

IN THE RED

Our glidepath to insolvency.

When Ross Perot won an impressive 19 percent of the popular vote as an independent candidate for president in 1992, his main issue was the national debt. In one of his unusual, half-hour-long campaign ads, Perot declared, "Just this year, we ran up \$341 billion in new debt . . . That's our legislators and our president trying to buy our vote, this year, with what used to be our money."

Three decades later, our national debt—which reached \$4 trillion the year that Perot ran—has hit \$30 trillion. If our debt were to keep rising at that rate over the next 60 years, it would increase more than 50-fold and surpass \$1.5 quadrillion (a quadrillion, which sounds like a made-up number, is a thousand trillions).

The portion of the national debt that really matters is the almost 80 percent that's held by entities—whether foreign or state-side—other than the federal government. Such "debt held by the public," which is fueled by deficit spending, has to be paid back to outside entities, whereas debt *not* held by the public merely involves intragovernmental transfers. Foreign holdings compose about a third of all debt held by the public. Japan and China hold by far the most (over \$1 trillion each), some of which belongs to private investors and some to government entities. Put another way, China—an increasingly hostile world superpower—has more than \$1 trillion of leverage over us.

It's getting worse, fast. Our recent deficit spending has been truly historic. In 2020, based on official federal tallies (the basis for all figures in this essay), the federal government brought in \$3.4 trillion in tax revenues and dished out \$6.6 trillion in spending—so, for every \$10 that came in, \$19 went out. This lavish expenditure smashed the deficit record like New York's Bob Beamon smashed the long-jump record in the 1968 Olympics. Beamon soared past the previous record—27 feet, 4¾ inches—to make an astounding 29-foot, 2½-inch jump. In similar fashion, with the deficit record sitting at \$1.4 trillion, the federal government in 2020 spent a spectacular \$3.1 trillion that it didn't have. In 2020 alone, the government racked up more deficit spending than it had during the first 36 fiscal years of the postwar era (1947 through 1982), and that's after adjusting for inflation.

Even before our blowout spending during COVID, our deficits had already reached breathtaking levels. In constant 2012 dollars (to adjust for inflation), the average annual deficit during the four years from 2016 through 2019—a stretch of relative peace and prosperity—was \$700 billion. In comparison, during the four years from 1942 through 1945—during which we funded and fought a two-front war against Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan—the average annual deficit was \$505 billion in constant 2012 dollars. After the war (using the Office of Management and Budget's composite deflator), we owed \$3 trillion of debt held by the public in constant

2012 dollars (four times what we owed when the war began). Subsequent statesmen succeeded in cutting that tally in half by 1974 (to \$1.5 trillion), but it rose back to end-of-World-War-II levels by 1986 (to \$3 trillion), doubled end-of-World-War-II levels by 2008 (\$6 trillion), tripled them by 2010 (\$9 trillion), quadrupled them by 2014 (\$12 trillion), quintupled them by 2019 (\$15 trillion), and sextupled them by 2020 (\$18 trillion).

In other words, we added as much debt held by the public in 2020 alone as we did from the end of World War II to the end of 2008, and we racked up more debt in the 12 months of 2020 than we did during the four years of the Second World War. That's after adjusting for inflation.

NO BIG DEAL

And yet, incredibly, many politicians and commentators claim that our staggering indebtedness is nothing much to worry about. Unwilling to face the challenge of reining in the budget, we seem to have thrown up our hands in recent years and chosen to treat our ballooning deficits as funny money.

Debt apologists like to measure taxes, spending, and debt in relation to the gross domestic product (GDP), rather than in relation to inflation or population growth. That way, if Americans' tax bills double, but the economy doubles in size over that same span, it can be said that Americans aren't paying any more in taxes (as a percentage of GDP). The same thing is true with the debt, which only rises by this measure if it increases faster than economic output.

This way of talking partially masks the magnitude of our debt problem by assuming that our government should grow every bit as fast as our economy. Even so, by the percent-of-GDP measure, debt held by the public is now at approximately end-of-World War II levels. But whereas it fell dramatically after World War II, there is no reason to think it will do so now. It more than tripled from 2001 (32 percent of GDP) to 2020 (100 percent of GDP), putting us on course to surpass 300 percent of GDP if it grows at the same rate from 2020 to 2039.

For all of the myriad cultural, technological, and moral problems we face, few things would guarantee the undoing of the founders' experiment in self-government more surely than continuing to pile on the burden, to ourselves and our posterity, of runaway debt. Thomas Jefferson described fiscal profligacy as a precursor to inevitable misery and suffering, the first in a stampede of apocalyptic horsemen. "[T]he fore horse of this frightful team is public debt," he wrote. "Taxation follows that, and in its train wretchedness and oppression." This wretchedness will only be more keenly felt as interest rates rise. Too much debt puts power in the hands of our enemies and renders the average American poorer every year.

MANDATORY BANKRUPTCY

The first step in avoiding a truly calamitous, debt-ridden future is to understand how we got ourselves into this predicament to begin with. It is not national defense or even the New Deal but rather the Great Society that is bankrupting us.

A fundamental preliminary question is whether our government taxes too little or spends too much. The answer is easy to determine. In 2021, the federal government collected more than three-and-a-half times as much money, in real dollars per capita—that is, above and beyond inflation and population growth—as it did at the start of the postwar period. But it spent nearly seven times as much. From 1947 (the first postwar fiscal year, as FY 1946 began in July of 1945) through 2021, the population of the United States rose 2.3-fold, while prices rose nearly 13-fold. Combining these two factors, the federal government could have collected and

spent 29 times as much in nominal dollars in 2021 as it did in 1947 without collecting or spending any more in real (inflation-adjusted) dollars per capita. Instead, the federal government taxed more than 100 times as much in 2021 as in 1947 and spent almost 200 times as much. By any reasonable standard, our government isn't afflicted by a shortage of tax revenues but by an almost endless appetite for spending.

What are we spending all of that money on? *Contra* the Left's repeated claims, it isn't defense—and our debt problem wasn't created by Ronald Reagan. We actually spend less per capita on defense now, after adjusting for inflation, than we did during the Kennedy Administration. Real per-capita defense spending fell from \$2,283 in 1962 to \$1,953 in 2020, a drop of 14 percent. Even at the height of the Reagan defense buildup, we exceeded the 1962 level by only 2 percent. Meanwhile, real per-capita spending on everything but defense increased more than eight-fold (from \$1,930 in 1962 to \$15,646 in 2020). If overall federal spending had followed the same trajectory as defense spending, we would have had a surplus in 2020 of \$2.1 trillion instead of a deficit of \$3.1 trillion.

The problem isn't defense: it's health care. More specifically, it was Lyndon Johnson and his (mostly) Democratic congressional allies who put us on a glidepath toward insolvency with the passage of their Great Society programs. The New Deal put strain on the federal budget, to be sure, but not enough to break it. By 1964, over three decades after Franklin Roosevelt had taken office, federal debt held by the public had fallen more than 40 percent from the end of World War II, in real (inflation-adjusted) dollars. The real deficit was 1/68th as large as it would be in 2020. As the first Ford Mustangs rolled off the assembly line, the country's debt was manageable and dropping, its deficits were minimal, and seven of the postwar years had actually produced surpluses. The next year, Johnson signed legislation creating Medicare and Medicaid.

Broadly speaking, there are two ways to fund federal programs. Congress either decides how much funding a program will get ("discretionary" spending), or just puts a program on autopilot and finds out later how much it turned out to cost ("mandatory" spending). With discretionary spending, Congress decides each year how much money to appropriate (for something like national defense), taking into account such quaint notions as what we need and what we can afford. With "mandatory" spending, Congress creates a program and pledges to fund it at the same time, even though no one knows what its price tag will be.

Within "mandatory" spending, there are programs that have a dedicated and generally sufficient revenue stream (such as Social Security), and there are those that do *not* have a dedicated revenue stream that comes anywhere near covering their costs—such as Medicare and Medicaid (and Obamacare, part of which expanded Medicaid). Payroll taxes cover only about a third of Medicare's costs and none of Medicaid's. In other words, no one who launched these programs had any idea how to pay for them.

This has had extraordinary consequences. The first year that Medicare spending visibly hit the books was 1967. From that point through 2020, Medicare and Medicaid cost a combined \$17.8 trillion, while our combined federal deficits over that same span were \$17.9 trillion. In essence, our deficit problem is a Medicare and Medicaid problem.

THE FATHER OF OUR DEBT

By 1975, a decade after they were created, Medicare and Medicaid were entrenched. From that point through 2019—the most re-

cent "normal" (pre-COVID) spending year—real per-capita Medicare and Medicaid spending rose nine-fold (more than triple the rise in Social Security costs over that period). In 1975, we spent more than five times as much on defense as on Medicare and Medicaid combined. By 2019, we spent 56 percent more on Medicare and Medicaid than on defense.

In 2019, the federal government collected about \$10,500 in revenues per capita and spent about \$13,500. Here's how Americans' contributions to the federal treasury were allocated. The first \$1,000 essentially just went into the trash—it was used to pay interest on the debt, not to buy anything. About \$2,000 was spent on defense and another \$2,000 on non-defense discretionary spending. Roughly \$3,000 was spent on Social Security, \$3,000 on Medicare and Medicaid (with about a 60 percent-40 percent split between them), and \$2,500 on other "mandatory" spending, to include much of Obamacare, unemployment, welfare, etc. So, in all, about \$4,000 (or roughly 30 percent) was discretionary spending, actually voted upon by Congress, and about \$9,500 (roughly 70 percent) was either "mandatory" spending or payments on the national debt.

If we had a Mount Rushmore of deficit spending, then, Lyndon Johnson would merit George Washington's place of honor as the father of our debt. Beside him would be the three most recent presidents. For we have run up more debt under Barack Obama, Donald Trump, and Joe Biden—even after adjusting for inflation—than we did under the previous 42 presidents combined. After a brief period of fiscal responsibility under Bill Clinton, the average annual deficit soared to \$455 billion under George W. Bush (\$41 billion more than under his father), \$857 billion under Obama, and \$1.462 trillion under Trump (who was averaging \$805 billion even before COVID hit).

Again—amazingly—these figures are adjusted for inflation. They are based on each president's having been responsible for the deficit the year after he took office—for example, Obama, who took office when fiscal year 2009 was already underway, was responsible for fiscal years 2010 through 2017. But note the following exceptions: the \$179 billion in Obama-signed "stimulus" funds spent in 2009, and the \$1.115 trillion in Biden-signed COVID "stimulus" funds spent in 2021 are treated as part of Obama's and Biden's deficit tallies, respectively; and the \$147 billion in TARP loans repaid in 2010 (\$110 billion) and 2011 (\$37 billion) are counted as reductions in George W. Bush's deficit tallies, as they paid back money that was counted as deficit spending when it was loaned out on Bush's watch.

Clinton is the obvious outlier, having managed an average annual surplus of \$3 billion during his eight years in office, six of them with a Republican Congress. After Perot sounded the alarm and Republicans won the House for the first time in four decades, Speaker Newt Gingrich and his Republican colleagues—working with Clinton—made good on the Contract with America's pledge to balance the budget. They cut defense spending, passed welfare reform, benefitted from a strong economy that increased revenues, and were able to lower federal interest payments as the debt fell. Most surprisingly, however, they managed to cut Medicare spending, via reforms passed through the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (BBA). After Medicare's costs had quadrupled from 1982 to 1997, they actually dropped from 1998 to 1999—not just in comparison to inflation, but in terms of the actual number of dollars that went out the door.

It was around this time that the "experts" decided the work was done and the free-spending days could return once again. In

2002, after the George W. Bush tax cues had been enacted, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projected that the federal government would run a surplus in nine out of the ten years from 2003 through 2012 and a decade-long surplus of \$2.3 trillion. It turned out that the federal government ran a deficit in all ten of those years and a decade-long deficit of \$7.1 trillion. The CBO also projected that debt held by the public at the end of 2012 would be \$1.3 trillion. It turned out to be \$11.3 trillion, so the CBO was off by \$10 trillion and a factor of nearly nine.

Despite this subsequent debt explosion, the Clinton-Gingrich era was a successful one in terms of fiscal responsibility. Indeed, over the past 40 years, deficits have been lowest when a Democrat has been in the White House and Republicans have controlled both houses of Congress. The second-best scenario has been a Republican president with either party controlling both houses of Congress. Next-best has been a Democratic president paired with a mixed Congress (with each party controlling one house), followed by a Republican president paired with a mixed Congress. The worst scenario has been Democratic control of the whole government. Over the past four decades, Democratic control (average deficit of \$1.1 trillion in constant 2012 dollars) has been more than twice as costly as Republican control (\$490 billion).

No matter who is in power, however, about 70 percent of our spending—consuming about 90 percent of our tax revenues—is on autopilot. To balance the budget by focusing solely on cutting those portions of the budget that Congress actively controls through the appropriations process, we would have to cut discretionary spending—which includes defense—by about 75 percent. Any realistic effort to balance the budget, therefore, must focus on "mandatory" spending.

FIXING OUR MESS

Medicare absolutely must be reformed. Its autopilot has malfunctioned and is flying not only the plane but also the country into the ground. We came tantalizingly close to fixing things back in 1999, when the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare grew out of the BBA and drafted an appealing blueprint for reform. The Commission, chaired by Democratic Senator John Breaux and Republican Congressman Bill Thomas, floated a variety of proposals, most notably "premium support," which would utilize private competition to keep public costs down. But events intervened: Politico healthcare editor Adriel Bettelheim writes that "with the Monica Lewinsky scandal festering and the threat . . . of impeachment growing, [Clinton] took a very public turn to appease his left flank" and turned against the commission just as it was wrapping up its 11 months of work.

Nevertheless, the commission was a serious effort at exploring promising ideas, many of which Congressman Paul Ryan picked up during his Obamacare-fighting era. Ryan's advocacy of premium support did not keep him from being tapped as Mitt Romney's 2012 running mate, nor did it hurt the Romney-Ryan ticket (Romney did that all on his own). This suggests that Medicare reform can be politically viable when advanced with determination and skill.

Medicaid also cannot go on in its present form. Its funding system, whereby every \$1 of state funding is matched by between \$1 and \$9 of federal funding, invites waste and inefficiency. The more a state spends on Medicaid, the more federal money it gets. If it manages to reform its Medicaid program, it gets at most half of the savings—usually far less. Also, states often hire consultants who concoct elaborate shell games to exaggerate states' Medicaid funding, thereby

bringing in even more federal money, much of which funds non-Medicaid ventures. If Medicaid were reformed so that each state simply received a given amount of federal funding, independent of the state's level of funding, that would presumably remove most of these perverse incentives and reduce Medicaid's costs.

Social Security has always been self-funded, but it too is projected to dip into the red about a dozen years from now. It poses nowhere near the threat to our fiscal solvency that Medicare and Medicaid do, but its costs have still risen faster than overall federal spending, and it does need to be sensibly revised. The percentage of the U.S. population that is over age 75 is roughly the same as the percentage that was over age 65 when Social Security was created, yet the eligibility age for receiving full retirement benefits has been raised just two years (from 65 to 67) over the past eight decades. Gradually (but not too gradually) raising that age to reflect current biological and fiscal realities is an obvious and necessary fix.

In addition to changing individual programs, there are measures we can take to promote fiscal responsibility more generally. Simply demanding a balanced budget, either as a matter of policy or through a constitutional amendment, will not do: the state could still spend as much as it accrued, which might encourage ever-greater levels of taxation to fund an ever-larger government, as in many European countries. Instead, we ought to focus on measures that can keep spending itself low.

For instance, the American citizenry would be more apt to view the debt as a shared concern if nearly everyone paid at least some income tax, as Florida Senator Rick Scott has proposed. At the least, no one's income tax bill should go negative, as it does when tax credits are made "refundable"—available not as a tax cut but as a payment to those who don't pay income tax. A few years ago, I released "The Main Street Tax Plan" (Hudson Institute, 2016), which the Tax Foundation said would reduce deficits. It declared, "Nearly everyone should be paying something in income tax, however small, and Americans shouldn't regard April 15 as a payday."

Some, such as Senator Mitch McConnell, oppose Scott's proposal because—in McConnell's words—it "raises taxes" (for people who don't pay income taxes). Those who share this concern should consider pairing refund reform with an end to the Medicare payroll tax. Unlike the Social Security payroll tax, which is viral and funds Social Security as a (more or less) pay-in-for-yourself program, the Medicare payroll tax funds only about a third of Medicare and helps perpetuate the false notion that Medicare too is mostly pay-in-for-yourself. Eliminating the Medicare payroll tax would soften the perception of Medicare as an entitlement, simplify the tax code, and ease the tax burden of the working poor. Combining this with Scott's plan would encourage more people to care about the size and scope of the federal government.

In 2010, back when the Tea Party was ascendant and the national debt was \$13 trillion rather than \$30 trillion, I proposed (in National Affairs) a Limited Government Amendment to the Constitution. Such an amendment would limit annual increases in federal spending to inflation plus two percentage points, except during a formally declared war, or if two-thirds of Congress and three-quarters of state legislatures authorized additional spending for other reasons. An amendment in this spirit could greatly facilitate fiscal restraint.

It has become fashionable to think of constitutional amendments as relics from the

past. But then, so are fiscal responsibility and—increasingly—representative government. The founders made the Constitution amendable for a reason, and we should take our cues from them. In the late 1990s, we showed—briefly—that it's possible to take action to reverse our course and help save our country from the tragic fate that Jefferson described. But the first step is to recognize that the \$30 trillion elephant in the room isn't going away. It's just growing bigger.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, sadly, to H.R. 2773. Although protecting our endangered species is truly a worthy cause, our country is not fiscally sound, and to commit \$1.4 billion a year in perpetuity is exactly the kind of spending that has landed us in the mess we are now in.

Let me be clear: we do not have the money. In the 30 years since 1992, the national debt has increased from \$4 trillion to \$30 trillion. Mr. Anderson notes in his article that:

At that rate over the next 60 years, our debt would increase by more than 50-fold to surpass \$1.5 quadrillion. In case one is wondering, a quadrillion is 1,000 trillions.

Mr. Speaker, some might say: Just raise taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, the author of the article points out that, in fact, the Federal Government last year taxed over 100 times what it did in the first postwar year and spent nearly 200 times as much. So taxes are not the problem. Spending is the problem.

The \$1.4 billion per year is perpetual. Now, under anyone's measure, perpetuity is a long time. Since this money will never be paid back, some might say like those deep in credit card debt: We will just pay the interest.

The interest on \$1.5 billion for 30 years at current rates of 3.4 percent is \$51 million a year. But, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at the current total interest bill. It is estimated to be almost \$400 billion a year or about 8.7 percent of everything we spend.

Why would we add to this enormous obligation?

There is a quote by Ernest Hemingway: How did you go bankrupt?

The answer is: Gradually, then suddenly.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly how bankruptcy works. You can keep spending recklessly and rack up debts for a while—even a long while—but at some point, it comes to an end abruptly. We have ignored our Nation's spending problems for far too long. We have been going bankrupt gradually, and I fear the day will come when we will go bankrupt immediately.

We must correct this course. For this reason, I cannot support, sadly, this bill.

□ 1515

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that hunting and angling collectively support over \$200 billion in economic activity annually, including over 1.5 million jobs as well as almost \$15 billion in Federal tax revenue.

My home State of Michigan, the Great Lakes State, is home to almost

650,000 licensed hunters and over 1.1 million licensed fishermen and -women as of last year. However, with over 40 percent of freshwater fish at risk, and significant declines in game and nongame species that support local ecosystems, we need RAWA's investments in on-the-ground conservation to support hunting and fishing for future generations, which is why the major sportsmen's groups, like the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation and Ducks Unlimited, have endorsed this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA).

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Recovering America's Wildlife Act.

This is a proactive piece of bipartisan legislation that would help our State and Tribal fish and wildlife agencies with the recovery and conservation of close to 12,000 species of fish, wildlife, and plants.

Now, I support this bill not only as the United States Representative for the central coast of California, a district that values and cherishes our wildlife, but also as the vice chair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus.

As some of the most passionate wildlife conservationists across our country, many sportsmen and -women, including those in the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, no matter what their political persuasion, support this critical piece of legislation.

In addition to enhancing the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts, sportsmen and -women want to ensure that our species are protected and perpetuated. From bighorn sheep to the Sierra Nevada red fox, from the California condors to the coho salmon, and from moose to monarch butterflies, the intent of this legislation is to protect those and thousands of other iconic animals well before they need to be listed as endangered or threatened.

This way, rather than impose burdensome and costly regulations on fish and wildlife managers, sportsmen and -women, and private businesses, those species can be recovered and renewed well before any measures are mandated.

Look, it is estimated that it costs the Federal Government more than \$19 million, on average, to recover a single species once it is listed, including \$1 million to just list the species and \$18 million for the science and habitat work. Let's simply take 2,000 of the 12,000 species this bill would help conserve, and it would cost the Federal Government at least \$38 billion. This bill is a preventative measure to ensure that does not happen.

Through this legislation, we would not only save billions of dollars by not having to list species, but we would save thousands of plants and animals by ensuring that they are protected.

By providing millions of dollars in funding for the on-the-ground efforts,

we could recover, reintroduce, and restore wildlife, fish, flora, and fauna throughout our Nation.

As many species face the growing threat of becoming extinct at accelerated rates, due to changing global weather events and our climate crisis, this legislation and its proposed funding would protect those species well before they become endangered.

That is why sportsmen, community members, and my country members support this bill, and that is why I urge my colleagues to do the same by voting for and passing the Recovering America's Wildlife Act.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I know that we all like the idea of dynamic scoring, and I spend a lot of money on hunting and fishing myself, as do a lot of other Members of Congress. But CBO, unfortunately, does not take that into account.

I know we all think that this bill could help not have listings of endangered species. But case studies clearly show that Federal money alone will not keep species off the endangered species list.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the record the CBO score from the Senate version of the language that is in this bill.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 26, 2022.

Hon. THOMAS CARPER,
Chairman, Committee on Environment and Public Works, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost

estimate for S. 2372, the Recovering America's Wildlife Act of 2022.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Madeleine Fox.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director.

Enclosure.

S. 2372, RECOVERING AMERICA'S WILDLIFE ACT OF
2022—AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON
ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ON APRIL 27, 2022

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—		
	2022	2022–2027	2022–2032
Direct Spending (Outlays) ..	0	7,049	14,082
Revenues	0	0	0
Increase or Decrease (–) in the Deficit	0	7,049	14,082
Spending Subject to Appropria- tion (Outlays)	0	1	not estimated

Statutory pay-as-you-go procedures apply? Yes.

Increases on-budget deficits in any of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2033? \$5 billion.

Mandate Effects:

Contains intergovernmental mandate? No.
Contains private-sector mandate? No.

The bill would:

Make funds available to the Department of the Interior for grants and other support for wildlife conservation by states, territories, and Indian tribes.

Allow the department to spend interest accrued on certain unspent balances for wildlife conservation.

Estimated budgetary effects would mainly stem from:

Spending without further appropriation on authorized activities.

Spending of interest credited from amounts invested in Treasury securities.

Bill summary: S. 2372 would amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and appropriate funds for the Department of the Interior to support efforts by state, local, and tribal governments to conserve endangered and threatened species. The bill also would allow interest accrued on unspent balances in one account to be available without further appropriation for those activities.

The bill would require the President to provide the Congress each year with a list of threatened or endangered species and to estimate the amount of funding allocated for their conservation. S. 2372 also would direct the Government Accountability Office to study the progress of states, territories, the District of Columbia, and Indian tribes in protecting endangered and threatened species and to report its findings seven years after enactment.

Estimated Federal cost: The estimated budgetary effect of S. 2372 is shown in Table 1. The costs of the legislation fall within budget function 300 (natural resources and environment).

Basis of estimate: For this estimate, CBO assumes that S. 2372 will be enacted near the end of fiscal year 2022. On that basis, CBO expects that outlays from funds provided in 2022 would occur in 2023. Using information from the affected agencies and historical spending patterns for similar activities, CBO estimates that enacting S. 2372 would increase direct spending by \$14.1 billion over the 2022–2032 period.

TABLE 1.—ESTIMATED BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF S. 2372

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—												
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2022– 2027	2022– 2032
Increases in Direct Spending													
Title I, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:													
Budget Authority	850	1,100	1,200	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	7,050	13,550
Estimated Outlays	0	645	1,218	1,336	1,359	1,293	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300	5,851	12,351
Title II, Bureau of Indian Affairs:													
Budget Authority	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	98	585	1,073
Estimated Outlays	0	98	78	94	107	99	98	98	98	98	98	476	963
Title III, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:													
Estimated Budget Authority	188	191	192	193	3	1	*	0	0	0	0	767	768
Estimated Outlays	0	191	154	185	120	73	38	8	0	0	0	722	768
Total Changes in Direct Spending:													
Estimated Budget Authority	1,135	1,388	1,489	1,590	1,401	1,399	1,398	1,398	1,398	1,398	1,398	8,402	15,390
Estimated Outlays	0	933	1,450	1,615	1,586	1,465	1,435	1,405	1,398	1,398	1,398	7,049	14,082

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding; * = between zero and \$500,000.
S. 2372 would require annual reports whose cost would total \$1 million over the 2022–2027 period, subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Direct spending: S. 2372 would establish new accounts in the Treasury, specify the amounts to be deposited into those accounts each year, and make the funds in those accounts available to the Secretary of the Interior to spend without further appropriation. In 2021, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) spent \$713 million for similar activities.

Title I would make \$850 million available in 2022 for USFWS to make grants to state, local, and tribal governments for wildlife conservation. The amounts made available would increase in 2023 and 2024. In 2025 and every year thereafter, title I would make \$1.3 billion available for those purposes. CBO estimates that enacting this title would increase direct spending by \$12.4 billion over the 2022–2032 period.

Title II would make \$97.5 million available in 2022 and every year thereafter for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to help Indian tribes conserve species on tribal land that have the greatest need for conservation. CBO estimates that enacting this title would increase direct spending by \$963 million over the 2022–2032 period.

Title III would make \$187.5 million available each year from 2022 through 2025 for USFWS to make grants to states and Indian tribes for the conservation of endangered and threatened species and to carry out other authorities under the Endangered Species Act. A portion of those amounts—\$75 million each year—would be made available to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation to recover threatened or endangered species. CBO estimates that enacting this provision in

title III would increase direct spending by \$750 million over the 2022–2032 period.

In addition, title III would direct the Department of the Treasury to credit interest on unspent balances made available under that title to USFWS. That interest would be available to spend without further appropriation for recovery efforts under the Endangered Species Act. (Crediting interest to an account in the Treasury is an intragovernmental transfer and thus would have no budgetary effect but allowing the agency to spend the accrued amounts would increase direct spending.) Using the interest rates underlying the May 2022 baseline projections, CBO estimates that under this provision, \$18 million would be accrued and spent over the 2022–2032 period.

The bill would permit USFWS to accept and spend donations. CBO estimates that the effect on net direct spending from donations would be negligible over the 2022–2032 period.

The bill would authorize the transfer of some penalties collected under current law to the accounts established under title I and title II, but S. 2372 would not authorize any new penalty collections.

Spending subject to appropriation: S. 2372 would require the President to submit to the Congress lists of threatened or endangered

species for which recovery efforts would be funded under the bill and to report annually on the amounts allocated for endangered species recovery, interagency consultation, and conservation activities. Using information about similar activities, CBO estimates that producing the annual reports would cost \$1 million over the 2022–2027 period; any spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds.

Under the bill, the Government Accountability Office would report in 2029 or 2030 on

conservation efforts authorized in the bill. Based on the cost of similar reports, CBO estimates that the cost of that report would be insignificant.

Pay-As-You-Go considerations: The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 establishes budget-reporting and enforcement procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or revenues. The net changes in outlays that are subject to those pay-as-you-go procedures are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2.—CBO'S ESTIMATE OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS OF S. 2372, THE RECOVERING AMERICA'S WILDLIFE ACT, AS REPORTED BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ON APRIL 27, 2022

	By fiscal year, millions of dollars—												
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2022–2027	2022–2032
	Net Increase in the Deficit												
Pay-As-You-Go Effect	0	933	1,450	1,615	1,586	1,465	1,435	1,405	1,398	1,398	1,398	7,049	14,082

Increase in long-term deficits: CBO estimates that enacting S. 2372 would increase on-budget deficits by more than \$5 billion in all of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2033.

Mandates: None.

Estimate prepared by: Federal Costs: Madeline Fox, Mandates: Lilia Ledezma.

Estimate reviewed by: Susan Willie, Chief, Natural and Physical Resources Cost Estimates Unit; H. Samuel Papenfuss, Deputy Director of Budget Analysis; Theresa Gullo, Director of Budget Analysis.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this report does show that it will cost over \$12 billion in the first 10 years and \$1.4 billion thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today opposed to the underlying bill.

Americans are living in paralyzing fear, watching all of their household income get eaten up by the price of gas and household needs and watching their retirement security disappear in our new bear market.

The Biden and House Democrat approach has been to spend their way out of every problem, and look where it has gotten us.

The Recovering America's Wildlife Act is well intended. Of course, we conservationists support investments in our species. But there is still no pay-for. This is \$1.4 billion in perpetuity, with no pay-for or offset.

During committee markup, Republicans on the Natural Resources Committee simply asked to offset the spending that continues to punish Americans. But Democrats declined to negotiate in good faith and are choosing to aggravate inflation instead.

However, I offer legislation that will actually help fix the problem. The Endangered Species Act Flexibility Act will give the Interior Secretary options to help endangered species without crippling our economy.

Too often, the ESA is abused. Science is ignored, and the law is used as a weapon to stop much-needed development. Take, for example, the northern long-eared bat. The bat's massive range runs from Maine to Texas to Montana, with everything in between. You can see it on the map right here.

Northern long-eared bats are, sadly, afflicted with white-nose syndrome, a disease caused by a fungus that interrupts hibernation, leading to their death. The science is clear: This disease has nothing to do with human activity.

But because of declining population, the Fish and Wildlife Service is deciding whether to uplist the species, which would severely restrict logging, mining, and infrastructure building, like roads, bridges, ports, and more.

Would you like to spend that infrastructure money on upgrading projects anywhere on this map? Good luck if the northern long-eared bat is listed as endangered.

My ESA Flexibility Act will give the Interior Department the latitude to make species-specific habitat plans for endangered species, so we don't punish Americans who need a transmission line to get reliable power or need a bridge upgrade to drive to work.

I don't think a single Member of Congress here, across both aisles, would disagree that the Endangered Species Act is an imperfect law in desperate need of tweaks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. STAUBER. Therefore, I regret that my ESA Flexibility Act was not accepted as an amendment, but I look forward to the eventual passage of the ESA Flexibility Act into law.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before recognizing my colleague, I would like to talk about these costs and address the fact that dollars invested properly do save dollars.

I note that the droughts in the American West cost \$8.6 billion just last year, according to NOAA, and that the impact of wildfire cost over \$10 billion last year alone.

Restoration efforts, which this bill would help do, that make habitats and communities more resilient to climate change have an exceptionally high return on investment, such as reducing drought and wildfire risks, increasing

job opportunities, and growing local economies.

Conservation and restoration of key habitats help reduce the threats of wildfires and help States conserve water and improve water quality, making their water systems more resilient to the drought.

Finally, full implementation of State and Tribal wildlife plans will help species recover and be removed and even stay off the endangered species list, which is what we want, saving the U.S. taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

The large economic and social benefits of this legislation would boost our economy and help us deliver on our climate commitments for years to come as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy, and I appreciate her leadership on this. And she is right.

Looking at these issues in a comprehensive fashion, we see opportunities to not just save species, but to save money, and to deal with serious consequences that we are seeing.

I am from the Pacific Northwest. We are in the middle of a climate crisis. Last year, we had all-time records 3 days in a row for temperatures. And that same week, in British Columbia, they set an all-time record for Canada. And in the city that they set it, it burned down the next day.

Climate change, loss of habitat, severe weather, including wildfires, and the spread of invasive species, are taking their toll on animals, from fish and amphibians to birds and mammals.

As co-chair of the Animal Protection Caucus, I am particularly aware of the importance of saving our at-risk wildlife species.

More than 1,600 are already listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act because of our failure to act.

Oregon alone is home to more than 50 of these threatened and endangered species.

In States like Oregon, in partnership with Tribes, we have identified thousands more species that are at-risk and need conservation assistance.

With States and conservation partners working diligently to pass and develop conservation plans, we can make a significant difference. But we lack dedicated annual comprehensive funding to implement the plans which would be cost-effective.

With this bill, the Federal Government is stepping up in full partnership with the Tribes, with the conservation communities, and wildlife advocates.

The Recovering America's Wildlife Act will provide more than a billion dollars in dedicated annual funding for proactive, cost-effective model efforts, collaborative efforts by the States and Tribes to recover and protect at-risk species.

I fear it is a false economy to sometimes engage in shortchanging these efforts. The long-term cost to the environment, to our communities, is immense. And I am pleased to support this legislation because I think we can change this dynamic. I strongly urge people to support its passage.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I encourage the majority to put their estimates to the test. Let's make this a bill with a 7-year sunset like the amendment that I proposed. Let's come back, look at it, and see if it really did save money. If it really did save species, maybe we should fund it at more than \$1.4 billion a year. Maybe we can find that funding with an offset.

But the simple truth is it is all speculation right now, and we are getting ready to put a permanent mandatory spending program in place with no way to come back and have checks and balances on it without repealing the law. And how many times does that happen when Congress passes a law?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

□ 1530

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Regrettably, I will not be able to support this bill either. It is another \$1.4 billion of mandatory spending—no offsets, no sunset. This is another case of the runaway Biden inflation train gaining speed. The only question at this point to the American people is how spectacular the crack-up is going to be, and the American people know that.

When I go out and talk to them, I hear about two things: energy prices and inflation.

Well, here we have got another \$1.4 billion that are going to be poured into the tinderbox of the train to send it careening down the rails even faster. The only question is how spectacular the crack-up is going to be. Unfortunately, the American people are going to suffer the consequences.

The author of this bill just said that she would like to take some species off the endangered species list. There is

one that can come off right now—right now—that has recovered.

Representative BOEBERT and I proposed an amendment to de-list the gray wolf. It has recovered. The gray wolf is in the ESA "Hotel California." They can enter, but they never leave.

Twenty-five wildlife scientists from the upper Midwest a decade ago said, you need to de-list the wolf. We put together an amendment for this bill, and it was not considered.

Terribly unfortunate, because it is time for the Endangered Species Act to either be used properly and de-list a species like the gray wolf that is fully recovered, according to wildlife scientists, or else the ESA itself has to be reformed.

Those scientists, when you read their document that they wrote, specifically said, the Endangered Species Act is endangered because it is not being used properly.

Also, there is no language in this bill that prohibits funds from going to acquiring new Federal lands. Think about it this way: If you have a neighbor that doesn't repair their roof, it is leaking into their house, and they say we are going to go buy that lot next door. That, in effect, is what this bill will allow the Federal Government to do.

We are seeing across America, including in my district, that the Federal Government is not taking care of their lands appropriately. The Federal Government is becoming America's slumlord.

This bill has grant programs that even the most extreme environmental groups can apply for. Every time some taxpayer-funded, so-called corporate green group runs an ad, and you are going to see a lot of them here in 2022, claiming the sky is falling, just remember: You may have paid for it, and you may pay twice because you will get hit with inflation as a result of spending that the American people cannot afford.

I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to be able to testify on this bill. Unfortunately, I will not be able to support it, and I hope in the future that we can do better.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership on this issue.

I rise in support of the Recovering America's Wildlife Act, bipartisan legislation I am proud to cosponsor, that aims to make the most significant investment in wildlife and habitat conservation in a generation.

Across Washington State, across our whole country, we are facing widespread species decline that doesn't just threaten the health of our ecosystems. It threatens the recreation and tourism and fishing industries that our communities rely on.

That is why Democrats and Republicans support taking bold action to implement conservation efforts to con-

serve and restore habitat, to reintroduce native species, and to mitigate wildlife risk.

This bill is critical to helping our State and our Tribal wildlife managers put conservation measures in place to protect species before they become threatened or endangered.

On top of that, this bill will help us combat threats to ecosystems, including the European green crab, an invasive species that is destroying essential marine habitat for Dungeness crab and Pacific salmon and threatening our shellfish industry that so many of the families that I represent depend on.

Get this: Last year, more than 102,000 European green crabs were caught in Puget Sound and along Washington's coast. That was an astronomical 5,500 percent increase from 2019.

In response to that explosion in the green crab population, a series of disaster declarations were made by the Lummi Nation and the Makah Tribe concerning the green crabs' impact on Tribal culture and on their economies, and another a disaster was declared by the State of Washington to mobilize more resources.

While our Tribes and States and local partners and small businesses are working diligently to protect our region against the explosion of these invasive species, they need more resources to improve detection, increase control efforts, and pursue eradication of this invasive species.

This burden shouldn't fall entirely on the backs of our Tribes or on local taxpayers' backs. The Federal Government can and should step up and be a better partner in this effort, and this bill will do that. That is why I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

As I speak, the West is literally burning. Major infernos are devastating States like California, Arizona, and Alaska.

In New Mexico, the Hermit's Peak fire became the largest in State history nearly 1 month ago and is still not fully contained. This catastrophic fire has burned over 320,000 acres and cost taxpayers a whopping \$224 million in fire suppression costs.

In total, over 2.6 million acres have burned this year already, putting us on a pace to surpass every wildfire season in the past decade.

Homes have burned to the ground. Thousands of brave wildland firefighters have put their lives on the line. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent trying to tame fires so intense, they create their own weather systems known as firenadoes. Why?

The answer is simple. The lack of active forest management and decades of fire suppression and mismanagement have left our Nation's forests as dry as

powder kegs and ready to ignite from a single spark.

In the last decade, mismanagement caused over 70 million acres to burn, and we have no signs of it slowing down. According to the U.S. Forest Service, over one billion—that is billion with a b—acres across the country are at risk of experiencing severe wildfires.

That is why I am offering this amendment. My amendment seeks to add forest management activities such as mechanical thinning and prescribed burning that enhance or create wildlife habitat—that is, enhance or create wildlife habitat—or reduce the risk of destruction to wildlife habitat due to wildfires as acceptable projects under the Recovering America's Wildlife Act.

Catastrophic fires remain one of the single greatest threats to wildlife in Western States, such as my home State of Idaho.

In California, the Los Angeles Times reported in 2020 that the Bobcat fire turned one of the most abundant wildlife habitats with lush canyons and a mixture of rare and endangered species into an “apocalypse” that looked like ground zero after a nuclear explosion. Experts believe this fire would reverse decades of conservation efforts.

In Oregon, the 2020 wildfires have burned over 360,000 acres of critical spotted owl habitat, pushing the species into what researchers call an extinction vortex.

Catastrophic wildfires recently forced the State of Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to recommend moving the greater sage-grouse from threatened to endangered status in their State. This is the very action that RAWA seeks to prevent.

These wildfires also killed nearly half of the State's endangered pigmy rabbit population. A Seattle Times report stated that rabbits had asphyxiated as the fire, in its fury, devoured oxygen from the atmosphere. There was nothing but ash and dust. No movement. No footprints. There was no chance anything survived.

Is this what recovering America's wildlife looks like, choking animals in suffocating smoke, burning them alive?

These catastrophic wildland fires are polluting our air, degrading our water, releasing massive amounts of carbon into the atmosphere, and turning rich and diverse wildlife habitat into barren moonscapes.

Incentivizing better, more active forest management through my amendment will create healthier ecosystems and abundant habitat for diverse wildlife. That is exactly what this bill is intended to do. If we truly care about recovering America's wildlife, then you will support my amendment.

If we adopt this, we will instruct the Committee on Natural Resources to add my amendment to include the forest management activities that modify, improve, enhance, or create wildlife habitat or protect wildlife habitat from wildfires as acceptable uses of funding under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Idaho for making a point that it is really the underlying reason that we should be—or the underlying question we should be talking about is, Why do we need to recover America's wildlife?

It is because we have messed up badly. We have mismanaged our Federal lands. Catastrophic wildfires run rampant. That does nothing to help wildlife habitat, and it is sad that we are actually here looking for funding and ways to fix something that we should have already fixed, something that we shouldn't have broken in the first place.

I think there is a way to recover wildlife, if we would just simply manage the habitat that the wildlife lives in. That is the purpose of this bill, but it is going to take some worldview changes, and the so-called environmental groups that are pushing to stop the management activity are going to have to allow this activity to take place.

It doesn't matter how much funding we put out from the Federal Government; we are going to continue to see wildlife habitat destroyed, and we are going to continue to see the loss of wildlife.

So it is not a problem that simply throwing money at will fix, and it is, again, a problem where we should put a program in place, come back and evaluate it, and decide whether we want to continue the program based on the merits of the successes of it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I say to my colleague, I deeply agree that these fires are horrific in what they are doing to our natural resources and our habitat, but that is why this bill is so important.

It is not Washington telling the States or the Native lands or territories in the Native lands what to do. It is the State wildlife plans that are being drafted at the local level where they know what needs to be done that we will be funding and trying to prevent fires like that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the very distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, who leads all of us on so many of these issues.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2773, Recovering America's Wildlife Act. I thank Representative DINGELL and her colleagues that have worked diligently on this

legislation for a considerable amount of time.

In the midst of the species extinction crisis that we have, accelerated climate change, the loss of biodiversity, droughts, the wildfires that we just heard about, it is important to note that this legislation was built from the ground up; 1,800 organizations, as diverse as Duke Energy on one side of the political spectrum and the Environmental Defense Fund on the other side, both agreeing that the approach of this legislation is the right approach; 180-plus cosponsors represented in a bipartisan fashion.

This bill before us today will transform the state of wildlife conservation in our country.

As we know, America's wildlife faces numerous threats, including habitat loss, pollution, climate change, wildfire, drought, invasive species, and emerging diseases.

It provides a historic \$1.3 billion of dedicated funding for States and territories and \$97 million for Tribes to assist in their efforts to conserve, restore, and protect wildlife and habitat each year.

With that protection comes the resiliency for habitat and the overall resiliency for communities and our environment.

In the long run, this investment will save taxpayers money. It creates jobs, promotes tourism, and provides safety and resilience to those communities across our country.

Through habitat conservation and restoration, this bill makes habitats and communities much more resilient to the ongoing and accelerated issue of climate change. This is an important piece of legislation for each and every State, territory, and Tribe in our country, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1545

My friends on the other side of the aisle, my Republican colleagues are fiscal conservatives when they are not in the majority. When they are in the majority, that is not the pattern of behavior.

At the present time, nothing should be done is what is being preached:

Nothing should be done about the climate crisis.

Nothing should be done about wildlife extinction.

Nothing should be done about January 6 and our democracy. That was merely a mirage, a walk in the park that we should all forget.

Nothing should be done about our children and the danger that they are exposed to in our very schools.

Nothing should be done about the rising healthcare costs and prescription drug costs.

We can't do anything because of inflation and the rising gas prices, so the best thing to do is to do nothing.

Well, my colleagues, I support H.R. 2773 because it does something. It does something in a bipartisan, comprehensive way. If my colleagues want to talk

about climate change, if they want to talk about droughts, if they want to talk about wildfire, if they want to talk about fiscally prudent things to do, let's talk about this bill today. Support it with dedicated funding. Make the investment that will guarantee the dividends for ourselves and future generations.

I applaud Representative DINGELL and all the work of her colleagues and this piece of legislation, and I urge its support and urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about this bill being bipartisan. The original House version of the text did have 42 Republican cosponsors on it, which is a sizable number. That is a bipartisan bill.

There will still be Republicans who vote for this version, but as long as we are in the business of estimating today, I am going to estimate that it won't be the 42 cosponsors of the original text, which, again, was supplanted by the Senate version that didn't send all the money to the State and Tribal governments. It sent the money to U.S. Fish and Wildlife, part of the funding to U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

I have talked to some of the Republican Members who have cosponsored the bill, and their understanding was that the pay-for was going to be worked out. If we would just sponsor the bill, we would get the pay-fors worked out. We were told the bill will go to the floor, and we will work out the pay-fors. Well, here is the bill on the floor and there is still no pay-fors. It is still permanent mandatory spending, \$1.4 billion a year.

If this bill passes out of the House, and if for some reason it doesn't make it through the Senate and become law, then I hope to come back and work on a bill that has the same objectives but is fiscally responsible, a bill that has pay-fors, a bill that is not borrowing from our children, and a bill that is not permanent, one that actually gives Congress the authority to have oversight and to come back and analyze the language, to analyze the success of it, and make changes as needed as we go on.

We do this with the farm bill, we do it with other bills. I am not sure why we can't do it with Recovering America's Wildlife Act because it is a very important subject.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I say to my colleague, we have worked in good faith. We will continue to work in good faith.

The Senate, which doesn't work together as closely at times the way we do, has negotiated a legacy fund that is a bipartisan negotiated provision by the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. Actually,

more Republicans voted for that than Democrats did.

This bill has been supported by a broad cross-section of Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats. Quite frankly, there are some of your Senate Republican colleagues who will only support it the way it is now. I have talked to many Republicans who want to see this bill go through. I don't know how the final vote will be today. I know people want to support it.

By the way, it addresses a shared goal, what the Senate did, that third provision helping to move species off of the ESA listings more quickly. It contains guardrails on the use of funds that I know were important to my Republican colleagues. These include prohibitions on the use of funds to make any listing or critical habitat determination relating to the endangered or threatened status of any species or to acquire any Federal land, which I know is really important on your side.

The broad coalition supporting the bill, including the State wildlife agencies and sportsmen's groups, have also backed all these provisions. We are not done. If the bill passes the House, we will go to conference with the Senate. We will all be at that table. But the time is now. We need to get this done. We have lost almost 3 billion birds since 1970. We are losing 40 percent of our fish. You and I both fish. I am not as great a hunter as you guys are, but I was married to one. But they know what is happening. The time for action is now.

Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In closing, I just want to go back through the facts as we know them.

We know that we need to do better habitat management, whether it is forest, rangelands, oceans, rivers, or lakes. We know there are areas where we need to manage better. The intent of this bill is to let those management activities be done by the people who do it best, State and Tribal agencies.

I think there is a huge agreement in the House, both Republicans and Democrats alike, but that is a good thing. The problem we have with the bill, though, is the way that we are going to implement it in the financial times that we are in now, and looking back at history and seeing how we got in the condition that we are in. The spending problem in this country is not discretionary spending. It is not the appropriation bills that we should be debating and approving every year.

It is the mandatory spending. It is the cruise control programs that previous Congresses have put in place that are driving the deficit. Over 70 percent of our debt is due to mandatory spending. And here we are with record debt, record inflation, and we are talking about putting more on the mandatory side of the equation.

There is a path where we could get huge support. We could probably do

this, maybe even do it on a unanimous consent bill, and that would be if the majority would accept the amendment that I offered in the Rules Committee.

As the ranking member on the committee, I offered an amendment that would bring a lot of our Members on board, and it simply put a 7-year sunset in, make it an authorization and let the Appropriations Committee do their work.

We are not even going to vote on that. We are not even going to put it on the floor to see where the Members of the body are at. The Rules Committee took that off of the table. So we have no choice. No choice but to recommend that we vote "no" on this bill, that we come back to the table, that we look at something that everybody can agree on. Not just on the authorization, but on how we fund the bill. I think we can get there.

I hate to take it out of the House's hands and put it into the Senate's hands when we didn't give it a full effort on how to not only craft the legislation on what needs to be done on the ground, but how to pay for it, how to be fiscally responsible going forward.

So, again, I support the idea. I don't support the way we are paying for it. I have to recommend a "no" vote. I encourage my colleagues to vote "no," and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the constructive debate and input that we have had to date on Recovering America's Wildlife Act. This legislation is historic, and our shared efforts today will help move us one step closer to a bold solution to the biodiversity crisis and will establish conservation measures that will endure for generations, which I know we both care about.

The Recovering America's Wildlife Act has strong bipartisan support, the backing of hundreds of meetings of sportsmen's groups, hunting and fishing advocates, conservation organizations, environmental advocates, businesses, and countless others.

It will fund proactive conservation measures that will benefit every State and territory and contains a strong Tribal title to support Tribal organizations' efforts to protect wildlife on tens of millions of acres of land.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Recovering America's Wildlife Act. It will make a difference in every congressional district in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2773, the Recovering America's Wildlife Act. I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan, Congresswoman DINGELL, and Chairman GRIJALVA for their leadership in moving this critical legislation through our Natural Resources Committee and to the Floor.

The world is in the middle of an extinction crisis and, unfortunately, my state is at its center. As a result of climate change, invasive species and other environmental stressors, our islands have earned the unfortunate distinction of becoming the endangered species capitol of the world. Of the 1,225 endangered species listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, nearly 500 are found in Hawaii. Just last year, nine more of Hawaii's endemic species were officially reclassified as extinct.

The Recovering America's Wildlife Act will provide \$1.3 billion in support to states, territories and tribes to address wildlife conservation. The estimated \$60 million in annual funding to Hawaii will be essential to my state's ability to save our imperiled biodiversity and will increase the chance that species like the 'i'iwi (a Hawaiian Honeycreeper), 'Ōpe'ape'a (the Hawaiian Hoary Bat) and Kāhuli (Hawaiian tree snail) survive.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this legislation. Mahalo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part D of House Report 117-366 not earlier considered as part of the amendments en bloc pursuant to section 7 of House Resolution 1170 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Natural Resources or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments in part D of House Report 117-366 not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1170, I offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 3, 6, and 7, printed in part D of House Report 117-366, offered by Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK OF FLORIDA

Page 7, line 15, strike "and".

Page 7, line 20, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following:

(H) may be used to expand the use of innovative technologies, tools, strategies, or collaborative partnerships that accelerate, ex-

pand, or replicate effective and measurable recovery efforts for species of greatest conservation need and species listed as threatened or endangered under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and the habitats of such species.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

TITLE IV—REPORT

SEC. 401. REPORT.

The Secretary of the Interior shall, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, submit a report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives providing detailed information on the dollar amount of grants and contracts (including subcontracts), and the percentage of total awards and grants, that were awarded or allocated under this Act to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving educational institutions, Tribally-controlled colleges and universities, minority-serving educational institutions, minority-owned business enterprises, women-owned business enterprises, and community-based organizations that are principally administered by, operated by, or serving minority communities.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MS. SCHRIER OF WASHINGTON

Page 7, line 15, strike "and".

Page 7, line 20, strike the period at the end and insert "; and".

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following new subparagraph:

"(H) may be used for conservation infrastructure projects related to the protection and conservation of a species of greatest conservation need and the habitat of such species."

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. DAVID SCOTT OF GEORGIA

Page 7, line 15, strike "and".

Page 7, line 20, strike the period and insert "; and".

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following new subparagraph:

"(H) may be used to conserve and restore a native pollinator species which is a species of greatest conservation need."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this en bloc consists of four amendments: Amendment No. 3, offered by the gentlewoman from Texas; amendment No. 7, offered by the gentleman from Georgia; amendment No. 6, offered by the gentlewoman from Washington; and amendment No. 1, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida.

Amendment No. 3, offered by the gentlewoman from Texas, requires the Secretary of the Interior to submit a report to the House Committee on Natural Resources and the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works outlining the dollar amount of grants, contracts, and subcontracts, and the percent of total awards and grants that were awarded or allocated under RAWA to HBCUs and minority-serving institutions, minority- and women-owned businesses, and commu-

nity-based organizations serving minority communities.

Current conservation and restoration practices underutilize the breadth of traditional, indigenous, and local knowledge found in our communities. To be successful in our restoration and conservation goals, we must use all of the tools at our disposal.

Amendment No. 7, offered by the gentleman from Georgia, adds activities that support native pollinator conservation and restoration to the list of appropriate uses of funds from the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Subaccount.

While many State wildlife action plans already include projects that will conserve and restore native pollinator species and habitat, we recognize the important role that pollinators play in ecosystem functionality.

Twenty-seven States included monarch butterflies in their State wildlife action plans, and thousands of other pollinators are identified as species of greatest conservation need.

Our pollinators are at risk, and it is important that we not forget the important impact they have on our landscape.

Amendment No. 6, offered by the gentlewoman from Washington, clarifies that the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Subaccount funds may include conservation infrastructure projects related to the protection and conservation of a species of greatest conservation need and the habitat of those species.

Conservation infrastructure projects are cost-effective methods to enhance conservation and build climate resiliency. They can protect against excessive heat and coastal storms while improving wildlife habitat and carbon sequestration.

Conservation infrastructure projects improve the health and management of ecosystems so that they provide important benefits and services. Examples include managing stormwater runoff, improving water quality for wildlife, restoring wildlife habitat in the built environment, and attracting beneficial species.

□ 1600

Finally, amendment No. 1, offered by the gentlewoman from Florida, broadens the appropriate uses of Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Subaccount funds to include using innovative technologies, tools, strategies, or collaborative partnerships that accelerate, expand, or replicate effective and measurable recovery efforts for species of the greatest conservation need and endangered species.

Supporting the implementation and expansion of new, creative conservation methods is of the utmost importance if we wish to interrupt the ongoing mass extinction event. In this time of need, our species and ecosystems need all the help we can provide. Funding innovative ideas will fill the gaps left by traditional conservation methods while spurring research and creating jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes," and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also rise in support of this amendment en bloc.

None of the amendments included in this amendment en bloc would add more spending to this bill. Three of the amendments in this en bloc amend title I by adding more flexibility for State fish and wildlife agencies when they make conservation investments funded under this bill.

These amendments do not impose new mandates, but rather, provide States more tools to manage wildlife as they see fit.

Mr. SCOTT's amendment on helping pollinators and their habitats will enhance ongoing efforts aimed at helping the monarch butterfly. Pollinators are critical to ecosystem conservation around the world. That is why my Republican colleagues and I have continuously supported the Candidate Conservation Agreement with Assurances for the monarch butterfly, which allows private companies and landowners to contribute to proactive conservation.

The amendment from Congresswoman CHERFILUS-McCORMICK recommends that States prioritize funding toward innovative strategies and partnerships to recover species. I believe that innovation is critical for ensuring widespread species recovery. The current species recovery framework under the Endangered Species Act is not only outdated, but it is broken and needs innovation.

Republicans have offered numerous ideas to use innovation to spur species recovery. One idea from Representative HERRELL of New Mexico would help incentivize proactive Candidate Conservation Agreements that allow private companies and landowners to contribute toward at-risk species conservation through their own dollars and efforts. Sounds like a good, commonsense idea.

The outdated Endangered Species Act has become a top-down government approach that rarely works to help species or people. Innovative approaches like Ms. HERRELL's are much needed.

I was disappointed to see that the majority discarded amendments like Ms. HERRELL's without even giving us the chance to debate its merits on the House floor.

Representative STAUBER also had an innovative idea to update the Endangered Species Act that he offered as an amendment. His amendment would have provided the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with the flexibility to utilize so-called 4(d) rules for endangered species. Under a 4(d) rule, the Secretary of the Interior can issue a rule for individual species that tailors protections to that species' conservation and recovery. Unfortunately, again, the majority also ignored that amendment.

The amendment by Congresswoman SCHRIER is also included in this en bloc

by encouraging States to invest in "conservation infrastructure projects."

While States already have flexibility to decide how to spend the funding provided in title I of the bill, this amendment would give them the option to invest in natural solutions, such as buffer strips, wetlands—one of my favorite things—planting trees, and other natural solutions to environmental challenges.

Lastly, Congresswoman JACKSON LEE's amendment would require the Secretary of the Interior to issue a report within 1 year of this bill's enactment, detailing the percentage of total awards and grants that were awarded or allocated to institutions serving minority communities.

While I support this amendment and its reporting requirement, I have bad news for the sponsor. Because the bill lacks a sunset provision, there is little incentive and recourse for Congress to fix any problems. In other words, if the reports required by this amendment highlight a glaring flaw with the programs being carried out under this bill, there will be no guarantee that Congress will fix the problem. The same is true for the State reports required under the bill.

For that reason, I offered a commonsense amendment that would have included a 7-year sunset to ensure that Congress would have to fix any flaws associated with this new program. Unfortunately, as I stated earlier, my amendment was also blocked by the majority.

This bill and the process to rush this bill to the floor today are unfortunate. It could have been avoided, but at least the amendments included in this en bloc do not spend any more taxpayer money and provide some needed accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I support the en bloc, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we found an area of agreement this afternoon. I think we have more agreement than people realize.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the author of one of these very critical amendments.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be yielded to by the gentlewoman. I thank her for championing this outstanding legislation, and I thank my good friend for acknowledging the en bloc.

I will say that there is good news. The good news is that the Recovering America's Wildlife Act is once-in-a-generation funding for the conservation of threatened species of animals and plants as well as habitat preservation. I will discuss the importance of it as I also present to the body my amendment.

Let me, first of all, say I pay tribute to Ellison, 7 years old, and to Roy, 7 years old, my twin grandchildren who love every species that they can find within their backyard or anyplace else that you would take them. I see in their lifetime the vision of this legislation. They love the outdoors. They love

to see crawling things, and they are a boy and a girl.

Yet, what are we facing today? The world is facing an unprecedented loss of wildlife. Bird populations have declined almost 30 percent in the U.S. and Canada since 1970. Over 40 percent of America's freshwater fish are at risk of extinction, and State agencies have identified 12,000 species of wildlife in need of conservation.

The Speaker pro tempore knows that Texas and Louisiana experienced a catastrophic oil spill some years ago. I remember visiting oyster fishermen and others who were devastated. We need to get in there and make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, 12,000 species are currently identified as endangered in the United States, and 1,300 of them are in my State of Texas. As I said, fishermen are still crying out for help. Climate change poses an unprecedented challenge to plant and animal species due to wildfires, droughts, floods, and temperature shifts. Hurricane Harvey devastated the coast and the opportunities for wildlife. The resulting threat to biodiversity has the potential to disrupt our ecosystem and, with it, human quality of life and sustainability.

Urban sprawl as well as development of suburbs and exurbs also encroach on the habitat that supports biodiversity, and it has ripple effects that compound the gradation of our environment from climate change.

We want to be hanging in there with fisherman, sportsmen, bikers, hikers—bikers in the appropriate atmosphere, but hikers in particular.

Our children deserve to know the natural beauty of their country. They deserve to see the beauty of wildlife. They deserve to be good custodians of that, and the children need to be diverse.

So the amendment that I offer is to ensure that children will continue to spend their days fishing, gardening alongside bees, watching the migratory birds, but also looking at the wilds and the species that are in them.

The Recovering America's Wildlife Act provides \$1.3 billion in funding to protect our Nation's wildlife, \$50 million of which will go to Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this is a great effort. My amendment fixes and adds to this. By adding title IV, we stipulate the Secretary of the Interior must, no later than 1 year after passage, provide a report on the dollar amount of grants, contracts, and subcontracts that were allocated to historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving educational institutions, tribally controlled colleges and universities, and women- and minority-owned businesses.

My amendment goes into the broad span of Americans, brings them into

the arena, and gives a needed investment in people of color who deserve to be not only included but intentionally targeted in new conservation investments to open their eyes, to give them the opportunity, and to ensure our Native American friends are included as well along with women- and minority-owned businesses. Let them have an investment as well.

In addition, with the enactment of this legislation, my amendment would create a framework for prioritizing historically disadvantaged groups in environmental efforts, bring them, again, into the fold, which should be replicated in future efforts. This is an important step.

I want you to listen to me, historically Black colleges and Hispanic-serving institutions, this is also a day for you. Support this legislation, and we will expand and build and support America.

Mr. Speaker, as a staunch advocate for the environment I rise in support of the Recovering America's Wildlife Act of 2021.

This bill provides once-in-a-generation funding for the conservation of threatened species of animals and plants, as well as habitat preservation.

12,000 species are currently identified as endangered in the United States. 1,300 of those are in my home state of Texas.

In addition to providing \$1.3 billion in funding to protect our nation's wildlife—\$50 million of which will go to Texas—the Recovering America's Wildlife Act of 2021 designates portion of this federal funding for special projects that revitalize species facing a conservation need.

In addition to my support of H.R. 2773, I rise to put forth an important amendment to today's legislation.

Firstly, this legislation does not stipulate significant transparency regarding the handling of these funds.

Secondly, nowhere in this bill does it require the Department of the Interior to include people of color.

My amendment fixes both of those issues. By adding Title IV, we stipulate the Secretary of the Interior must, no later than one year after passage, provide a report on the dollar amount of grants, contracts, and subcontracts that were allocated to Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Hispanic-serving educational institutions, Tribally controlled colleges and universities, and women and minority owned business.

My amendment addresses a needed investment in people of color who deserve to be not only included, but intentionally targeted in new conservation investments.

Passage of this bill will encourage fairness in the allocation of contract, subcontract, and grant dollars, as well as greater transparency into the details of those allocations.

Climate change poses unprecedented challenges to plant and animal species due to wildfires, droughts, floods, and temperature shifts.

The resulting threat to biodiversity has the potential to disrupt our ecosystem, and with it, human quality-of-life and sustainability.

Urban sprawl as well as development of suburbs and exurbs also encroach on the habitat that supports biodiversity, and it has

ripple effects that compound the degradation of our environment from climate change.

This bill takes these problems seriously and provides funding for programs that are essential for human sustainability as well as the resilience of plants and animals.

Our children deserve to know the natural beauty of their country.

They deserve to grow up in an America teeming with wild strength, diversity, and beauty.

They deserve to embrace the long American history of wildlife sportsmanship, recreation, and appreciation.

By supporting H.R. 2773, we ensure that childhood days spent fishing at the lake, gardening alongside bees, or watching the flight of migratory birds are not things of the past.

Through this bill we preserve the heritage of our country.

Additionally, enactment of this legislation would create a framework for prioritizing historically disadvantaged groups in environmental efforts that should be replicated in future efforts.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, again, I support this group of amendments en bloc and encourage a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this en bloc package as well as the bill upon final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1170, I offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 2 and 8, printed in part D of House Report 117-366, offered by Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan:

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BENTZ OF OREGON

Page 34, after line 13, add the following new subsection:

(k) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Of the funds made available under each of paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (e), not more than 1.85 percent may be used by the Secretary for administrative costs.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. TIFFANY OF WISCONSIN

Page 34, after line 13, add the following new subsection:

(k) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior ½ of 1 percent of the amounts made available under subsection (c) for the purposes of providing oversight and accountability with respect to expenditure of funds authorized under such subsection, to remain available until September 30, 2029.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, en bloc No. 2 consists of two good-government amendments offered by my Republican colleagues: amendment No. 2 offered by the gentleman from Oregon and amendment No. 8 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 2 stipulates that no more than 1.85 percent of funds can be used for administrative costs in the grant programs authorized by title III.

The purpose of the Recovering America's Wildlife Act is to fund on-the-ground efforts that are focused on conserving and restoring wildlife and habitat. This 1.85 percent cap will ensure that these dollars are being used toward actions that create the most impact.

Amendment No. 8 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin requires that half of 1 percent of the money in the Endangered Species Recovery and Habitat Conservation Legacy Fund be directed to the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior to oversee the expenditure of the fund.

This amendment will ensure that money from the Endangered Species Recovery and Habitat Conservation Legacy Fund is used appropriately and in a manner that is in line with the spirit of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on en bloc No. 2, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in wholehearted support of these amendments en bloc, which include amendments from our colleagues from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ) and from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

These amendments would ensure that the funds provided in title III are subject to the same overhead cap requirements and oversight measures as title I.

The original point of this bill was to empower States and Tribes to carry out species conservation, not set up another Washington, D.C.-based Federal program, which is now what the bill does. Not only does title III change that intent by giving more than \$180 million annually in the first 4 years to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, but it was also added at the Rules Committee and was not part of the bill that the Committee on Natural Resources marked up. Because the Committee on Natural Resources never had the

chance to debate this title when we marked up the original bill, we did not have the opportunity to add these good-governance amendments to it like we did for titles I and II.

I believe that title III should be removed altogether. Unfortunately, Representative MOORE's amendment, which would have removed title III, was not made in order, so we didn't even get the chance to debate it, much less vote on it today.

□ 1615

In the absence of that amendment, the least we can do is ensure funds allocated by title III are being spent responsibly and with some oversight.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for saying it quite well. The least we can do here is make sure that with these funds we try to have some oversight and responsibility in terms of how they are going to be spent. I thank the author for including this amendment in the bill.

If there is no pay-for, then there must be some measure of accountability for the expenditure of these funds ensuring the Department of the Interior Inspector General's office has the proper resources to monitor this spending.

Unfortunately, the bill in its current form has no sunset on the mandatory spending of \$1.4 billion, so I thank the gentlewoman for including this in the package.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ).

Mr. BENTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of my amendment No. 8.

This fiscally responsible amendment would establish a 1.85 percent administrative cap for the Department of the Interior when implementing title III of this bill.

Title I of the bill, which provides funding to State fish and wildlife departments for species conservation, includes a 1.85 percent administrative cap.

Title II of the bill, which covers Tribal Wildlife Conservation and Restoration, includes a 3 percent administrative cap for the Department of the Interior.

However, as currently drafted, title III does not have an administrative cap.

The original intent of this bill was to provide States with funding to conserve species of greatest conservation need.

Unfortunately, the majority decided to ignore the committee process by

airdropping in title III to give more funding to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Not only did they circumvent process to add the entire title to the bill, they didn't carry over any of the good government amendments made in committee.

Under the current text, the State and Tribal portions of the bill would be subject to strict administrative caps, but the Federal Government would not be. This is backwards, as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service needs much more oversight since the agency is part of the reason we find ourselves in the position we are currently in with respect to the broken Endangered Species Act.

Additionally, the programs funded in title III already receive existing appropriations, and if the majority would like to increase them, they should do it through the appropriations process instead of airdropping in another layer of statute and bureaucracy into the legislation.

For these reasons, title III should be struck from the bill. Unfortunately, the majority refused to allow a vote on my colleague from Utah's amendment that would have done just that.

The very least we can do is at least ensure that title III is subject to the same administrative requirements as the other titles.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I again encourage adoption of these amendments, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the en bloc package as well as the bill upon final passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE). Pursuant to House Resolution Number 1170, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part D of House Report 117-366.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 29, line 18, insert "and efforts to manage, control, and prevent invasive species,

disease, and other risks to such species" after "efforts".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) for offering this very important piece of legislation and to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MEIJER) for his support on the amendment that I am offering and all of our dedication to the Great Lakes being quite evident by this work.

Growing up in Michigan, my family would camp and fish every year in East Tawas, Michigan. We grew up on the Great Lakes. These are really fond memories I have from my childhood, and it is a particular honor as a result to represent 118 miles of Lake Huron shoreline in Congress.

Over the past couple of centuries, nearly 200 non-native species have established populations in the Great Lakes. In my home State, invasive species like Asian carp, zebra mussels, and phragmites threaten the health of our Great Lakes. Zebra mussels have clogged our water infrastructure costing millions in cleanup. Asian carp eat the wetland plants that are critical habitats for native fish and waterfowl. We have to prevent the spread of invasive species in our Great Lakes, we have an obligation to do that.

This bipartisan amendment would expand the ability of the Fish and Wildlife Service Endangered Species Recovery and Habitat Conservation Legacy Fund to manage and prevent invasive species. We believe this simple amendment makes this very good bill stronger and will have a positive impact on the Great Lakes economy.

When we protect our wildlife and natural resources, we strengthen our economy and we preserve our way of life. The Great Lakes are a source of drinking water for millions, a critical wildlife habitat, and help support 1 million jobs in boating, fishing, and tourism industries.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bipartisan amendment to protect our Great Lakes and strengthen our natural resources, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which adds more responsibilities to the already duplicative and expensive title III portion of this bill, which was never debated in the Committee on Natural Resources.

I have no objection to efforts aimed at controlling invasive species, and these efforts are already being carried

out by many Federal agencies. For example, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the agency funded by title III at the expense of State and Tribal funding, already administers invasive species control programs, including the Coastal Program and the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program, two programs that title III would duplicate.

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, or APHIS, at USDA monitors, responds to, and conducts control and eradication programs to address invasive species that pose a threat to U.S. agriculture.

These and other similar programs are subject to Federal appropriations, which is what title III should be subject to as well—not permanent mandatory funding. If the majority would like to increase Federal funding for invasive species control, they should do it through the appropriations process instead of airdropping another layer of bureaucracy into this bill.

For these reasons, we should be striking title III from the bill, at least until the committee of jurisdiction has a chance to consider and mark up its provisions. Unfortunately, the majority refused to allow a vote on my colleague from Utah, Mr. MOORE's amendment, which would have done just that.

I oppose this amendment to allow the funding for title III to be used for even more duplicative Federal bureaucracy.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and I agree that we ought to do everything we can to address this issue of invasive species. I just happen to believe that this bill is a very appropriate approach to this.

Coming from the Great Lakes, I will say we need every tool we can get our hands on to protect this incredible resource. I welcome the opportunity to include this language in this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), my colleague, friend, and the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Michigan for this amendment.

This bipartisan amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan and cosponsored by the Republican gentleman from northern Michigan makes it clear—or western Michigan, not from where DAN and I are, but it is Michigan—makes it clear that eligible funding for conservation activities under the Endangered Species Recovery and Habitat Conservation Legacy Fund include invasive species and disease management control and prevention efforts.

Invasive species and diseases pose severe threats to our Nation's wildlife population, especially for species that are already threatened or endangered.

Few places in the United States are more familiar with invasive species than the Great Lakes region which has

been battling sea lampreys, zebra and quagga mussels, and now Asian carp. Native fish species are smaller and less plentiful than they once were thanks to these invasive species.

On the disease front, chronic waste and disease, a fatal disease for North America's deer, elk, and moose have spread to 25 States posing significant risks to those populations.

To properly recover native species, we must provide the resources and coordinate efforts to eradicate or control invasive species, prevent new introductions, and better understand emerging diseases.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I have no more speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the debate and the conversation, but for me and I think for Congresswoman DINGELL, and certainly for Congressman MEIJER and anybody else who has grown up knowing and loving the Great Lakes, this is an important economic resource. It is an important cultural resource. It is literally the definition of the lines of our State.

Protecting the Great Lakes is an incredibly high priority for Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, people all across the spectrum. And every opportunity we have to take even a small step to do more to protect this precious water resource we are going to take that opportunity.

For that reason, I support the underlying legislation. I advocate on behalf of my amendment. I hope my colleagues will join me, Mr. MEIJER and Mrs. DINGELL in supporting it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, once again, we all have invasive species that we deal with. It is something we should be focusing on. We just don't need another duplicative Federal program to do that.

Madam Speaker, I encourage a “no” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR.
BUTTERFIELD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part D of House Report 117–366.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, as the designee of Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 24, insert “nonprofit organizations,” after “territories.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

□ 1630

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I thank Mrs. DINGELL and the ranking member for their courtesy, and I also thank the Natural Resources Committee for all the work they do. I am not on that committee, but I have great respect and admiration for the committee and its chairman. I thank you for letting me have 5 minutes to present this amendment.

Madam Speaker, this amendment is rather simple. It is straightforward. The underlying bill establishes a new, competitive grant program to support innovative strategies to help species recovery. That is the underlying bill we have been debating all afternoon. However, as drafted, the bill limits those competitive grants to only State wildlife agencies.

Specifically, my amendment expands the eligibility of the grant program to include nonprofit organizations like the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, the North Carolina Wildlife Federation, the Pamlico Albemarle Wildlife Conservationists, and so many more wonderful organizations in my State, and perhaps in your States all across the country.

Many of these nonprofits have tremendous expertise in helping species recover and they should be eligible to participate in this new program under this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment, which will strengthen our species recovery efforts.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, this amendment would actually make the bill worse by authorizing nonprofit organizations to receive funding under title I.

This amendment is in direct contravention to the original intent of this legislation, which is to empower States and Tribes in species conservation.

The current bill directs funds provided under this program to State and Tribal fish and wildlife departments or

to regional associations of fish and wildlife departments.

The amendment would allow activist environmental groups, many of whom are serial litigants against the kinds of projects this bill aims to support, to receive funding under title I, decreasing money available for State fish and game departments.

Radical special interest groups have weaponized the Endangered Species Act by continuously suing the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This sue-and-settle process overwhelms regulatory agencies, resulting in settlement agreements and consent decrees that require agencies to promulgate major regulations within an arbitrarily imposed timeline.

These agreements are often negotiated behind closed doors with little or no transparency or public input, allowing radical special interest groups to promote their own Federal policy agendas, outside of the normal processes.

To make matters worse, these groups are financially rewarded for suing the government, for suing the American taxpayer. According to the Government Accountability Office, from 2000 to 2010, ESA lawsuits cost taxpayers nearly \$24 million in attorneys' fees and associated costs.

Private citizens with a net worth of \$2 million and for-profit businesses with a net worth of \$7 million cannot receive attorneys' fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act. However, there is no such cap for nonprofit organizations, which allows these wealthy groups to rake in taxpayer money.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, from 2009 to 2017, there were 109 Endangered Species Act settlements. The majority of these settlements came from just three groups: the Center for Biological Diversity, Defenders of Wildlife, and the WildEarth Guardians. The Center for Biological Diversity was individually responsible for 41 of the 109 settlements.

This is not surprising after the Center for Biological Diversity's director said, in 2009, that "When we stop the same timber sale three or four times running, the timber planners want to tear their hair out. They feel like their careers are being mocked and destroyed—and they are. Psychological warfare is a very underappreciated aspect of environmental campaigning." We are paying them to do that.

Today we can see the legacy of this mentality and these lawsuits out West where we have had two of our worst fire years back-to-back, and this year is not looking any better.

I cannot in good conscience support allowing these radical groups to receive funding under this bill, especially since it will pull money away from State fish and wildlife agencies and Tribes, as the bill was intended to fund.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, I listened very carefully to the gentleman from Arkansas, and I respect his position, but I just want to remind my colleagues that in my State and most States these organizations that are not nonprofits who care about the environment and care about protecting endangered species—in most States and in all of your States—these are not radical groups. These are good grassroots nonprofit organizations who really care about the environment and want to do their part in protecting our economy and our environmental economy.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to please vote for this amendment. I understand the gentleman's concern, but I assure him that the nonprofits that I speak of are not radical groups, they are good environmental organizations.

Madam Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, this amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Arizona and the gentleman from North Carolina adds nonprofit organizations to the list of entities that are eligible to compete for innovation grants funded by the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Subaccount.

Ten percent of subaccount funds are used to fund innovation grants. These grants are meant to catalyze the innovation of techniques, tools, and strategies while fostering collaborative partnerships that accelerate, expand, or replicate effective and measurable recovery efforts for species of greatest conservation need and species listed under the Endangered Species Act.

Including nonprofit organizations in this competitive grant process will foster collaboration and ensure that the best strategies and efforts are being funded.

Madam Speaker, I am sure that none of the groups are the radical groups that you are referring to, but I don't know. It is a competitive process that will be carefully managed.

Madam Speaker, I support my colleague's amendment.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, there are some wonderful groups out there that do great work, but this bill is not about funding private groups or nonprofit groups. This bill is about funding State and Tribal entities. It is what it was originally about. It has changed, it is now funding the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as well. I guess the majority is thinking, why not just throw in some of these environmental groups. Who else will this bill be putting funding out to before it is said and done?

There are groups that abuse the process. They abuse it greatly. They abuse it at the expense of the American taxpayer. They abuse it at the expense of the environment. They claim they are wanting to help the environment and they are destroying the environment.

Madam Speaker, I am opposed to this amendment, and I hope my colleagues will join me in opposing it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, in closing, let me thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for supporting this amendment. It is a very simple amendment. It is a very commonsense amendment. It will allow and authorize nonprofit organizations, as Mrs. DINGELL said, to compete for funding.

It will not be a guarantee of funding. It will be an opportunity to compete for funding. It is a worthwhile amendment, and I ask my colleagues to vote "yea."

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1170, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will now resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

The following amendments to H.R. 2773:

- Amendments En Bloc No. 1;
- Amendments En Bloc No. 2;
- Amendment No. 4, offered by Mr. KILDEE of Michigan; and
- Amendment No. 5, offered by Mr. BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina.

A motion to recommit H.R. 2773, if offered;

Passage of H.R. 2773, if ordered; and

Motions to suspend the rules and pass:

- S. 516; and
- H.R. 7211.

The first vote in the series will be a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 1, printed in part D of House Report 117-366, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 276, nays 147, answered “present” 1, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

YEAS—276

Adams	Foster	McEachin
Aguilar	Frankel, Lois	McGovern
Allred	Gallejo	McHenry
Auchincloss	Garamendi	McKinley
Axne	Garbarino	McNerney
Bacon	Garcia (IL)	Meeks
Barr	Garcia (TX)	Meijer
Barragán	Gimenez	Meng
Bass	Golden	Mfume
Beatty	Gomez	Miller-Meeks
Bentz	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)
Bera	Gonzalez (OH)	Moore (WI)
Beyer	Gonzalez,	Morelle
Bishop (GA)	Vicente	Moulton
Blumenauer	Gottheimer	Mrvan
Blunt Rochester	Granger	Murphy (FL)
Bonamici	Graves (LA)	Nadler
Bost	Green, Al (TX)	Napolitano
Bourdeaux	Griffith	Neal
Bowman	Grijalva	Neguse
Boyle, Brendan	Harder (CA)	Newhouse
F.	Hayes	Newman
Brown (MD)	Herrera Beutler	Norcross
Brown (OH)	Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran
Brownley	Hill	Oberholte
Bucshon	Himes	Ocasio-Cortez
Bush	Hinson	Omar
Bustos	Horsford	Pallone
Butterfield	Houlahan	Panetta
Calvert	Hoyer	Pappas
Carbajal	Hudson	Pascarella
Cárdenas	Huffman	Payne
Carl	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Carson	Jacobs (CA)	Peters
Carter (GA)	Jacobs (NY)	Phillips
Carter (LA)	Jayapal	Pingree
Carter (TX)	Jeffries	Pocan
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Porter
Case	Johnson (SD)	Pressley
Castor (FL)	Johnson (TX)	Price (NC)
Castro (TX)	Jones	Quigley
Chabot	Joyce (OH)	Raskin
Cherfilus-	Kahele	Reschenthaler
McCormick	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
Chu	Katko	Rice (SC)
Ciilline	Keating	Rodgers (WA)
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Cleaver	Khanna	Ross
Clyburn	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Cohen	Kilmer	Ruiz
Cole	Kim (CA)	Ruppersberger
Connolly	Kim (NJ)	Rush
Cooper	Kind	Rutherford
Correa	Kinzinger	Ryan
Costa	Kirkpatrick	Salazar
Courtney	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
Craig	Kuster	Sarbanes
Crist	Lamb	Scanlon
Crow	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Davids (KS)	Lawrence	Schneider
Davis, Danny K.	Lawson (FL)	Schrader
Davis, Rodney	Lee (CA)	Schrier
Dean	Lee (NV)	Scott (VA)
DeFazio	Leger Fernandez	Scott, David
DeGette	Levin (CA)	Sewell
DeBene	Levin (MI)	Sherman
Demings	Lieu	Sherrill
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Simpson
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sires
Diaz-Balart	Luria	Slotkin
Dingell	Lynch	Smith (WA)
Doggett	Mace	Soto
Doyle, Michael	Malinowski	Spanberger
F.	Maloney,	Speier
Escobar	Carolyn B.	Stansbury
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Stanton
Espallat	Manning	Stefanik
Evans	Matsui	Stevens
Feenstra	McBath	Strickland
Fitzpatrick	McCarthy	Suozi
Fletcher	McCauley	Swalwell

Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone

NAYS—147

Aderholt	Fulcher
Allen	Gaetz
Amodei	Gallagher
Armstrong	Garcia (CA)
Arrington	Gibbs
Babin	Gohmert
Baird	Good (VA)
Balderson	Gooden (TX)
Banks	Gosar
Bergman	Graves (MO)
Bice (OK)	Green (TN)
Biggs	Greene (GA)
Bilirakis	Grothman
Bishop (NC)	Guthrie
Boebert	Harris
Brady	Harshbarger
Brooks	Hartzler
Buchanan	Hern
Buck	Herrell
Budd	Hice (GA)
Burchett	Higgins (LA)
Burgess	Hollingsworth
Cammack	Huizenga
Carey	Issa
Cawthorn	Jackson
Cheney	Johnson (LA)
Cline	Johnson (OH)
Cloud	Jordan
Clyde	Joyce (PA)
Comer	Keller
Crawford	Kelly (MS)
Crenshaw	Kustoff
Curtis	LaHood
Davidson	LaMalfa
DeLauro	Lamborn
DesJarlais	Larson (CT)
Donalds	Latta
Duncan	LaTurner
Dunn	Lesko
Elizy	Letlow
Emmer	Long
Estes	Loudermilk
Fallon	Lucas
Ferguson	Luetkemeyer
Fischbach	Malliotakis
Fitzgerald	Mann
Fleischmann	Massie
Fox	Mast
Franklin, C.	McClain
Scott	McClintock

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

McCollum

NOT VOTING—3

Casten	Guest	Miller (IL)
--------	-------	-------------

□ 1723

Messrs. MULLIN, BERGMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. ZELDIN, AMODEI, LARSON of Connecticut, JOHNSON of Louisiana, GALLAGHER, and Ms. MALLIOTAKIS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CALVERT, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. McHENRY, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Crist	Davis, Danny K.
(Balderson)	(Wasserman	(Beyer)
Bustos (Mrvan)	Schultz)	Deutch (Rice
Carter (TX)	Davids (KS)	(NY)
(Weber (TX))	(Neguse)	Evans (Beyer)
Correa (Huffman)		

Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Westerman
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth

Gonzalez (OH)
(Meijer)
Granger (Weber
(TX))
Johnson (GA)
(Manning)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Kelly (IL)
(Neguse)
Khanna (Watson
Coleman)
Lamb (Blunt
Rochester)
Lawrence
(Stevens)
Lawson (FL)
(Wasserman
Schultz)

Lynch
(Langevin)
Mace (Carter
(GA))
McEachin
(Beyer)
Moore (WI)
(Beyer)
Nadler (Pallone)
Newman (Beyer)
O'Halleran
(Schrader)
Palazzo
(Fleischmann)
Payne (Pallone)
Peters (Jeffries)
Pingree
(Wasserman
Schultz)

Price (NC)
(Manning)
Rice (SC)
(Meijer)
Schneider
(Stevens)
Speier (Huffman)
Stanton
(Huffman)
Suozi (Beyer)
Taylor (Van
Duyn)
Tenney
(Jackson)
Titus (Pallone)
Walorski
(Bucshon)
Waters (Takano)
Wilson (FL)
(Neguse)

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL OF MICHIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc No. 2, printed in part D of House Report 117-366, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 8, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

YEAS—412

Adams	Burgess	Davidson
Aderholt	Bush	Davis, Danny K.
Aguilar	Bustos	Davis, Rodney
Allen	Butterfield	Dean
Allred	Cammack	DeFazio
Amodei	Carbajal	DeGette
Armstrong	Cárdenas	DeBene
Arrington	Carey	Demings
Auchincloss	Carl	DeSaulnier
Axne	Carson	DesJarlais
Babin	Carter (GA)	Deutch
Bacon	Carter (LA)	Diaz-Balart
Baird	Carter (TX)	Dingell
Balderson	Cartwright	Doggett
Banks	Case	Donalds
Barr	Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael
Barragán	Castro (TX)	F.
Bass	Cawthorn	Duncan
Beatty	Chabot	Dunn
Bentz	Cheney	Elizy
Bera	Cherfilus-	Emmer
Bergman	McCormick	Escobar
Beyer	Chu	Eshoo
Bice (OK)	Ciilline	Espallat
Biggs	Clark (MA)	Evans
Bilirakis	Clarke (NY)	Fallon
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Feenstra
Bishop (NC)	Cline	Ferguson
Blumenauer	Cloud	Fischbach
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Fitzgerald
Boebert	Clyde	Fitzpatrick
Bonamici	Cohen	Fleischmann
Bost	Cole	Fletcher
Bourdeaux	Comer	Foster
Bowman	Connolly	Fox
Boyle, Brendan	Cooper	Frankel, Lois
F.	Correa	Franklin, C.
Brady	Costa	Scott
Brooks	Courtney	Fulcher
Brown (MD)	Craig	Gaetz
Brown (OH)	Crawford	Gallagher
Brownley	Crenshaw	Gallejo
Buchanan	Crist	Garamendi
Buck	Crow	Garbarino
Bucshon	Cuellar	Garcia (CA)
Budd	Curtis	Garcia (IL)
Burchett	Davids (KS)	Garcia (TX)

Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Walberg
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Issa
Jackson
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McHenry
Meuser
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)

Nehls
Newhouse
Norman

Obernolte	Schweikert	Timmons	Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Pappas	Hill	McHenry	Simpson
Owens	Scott, Austin	Turner	Cárdenas	Jacobs (NY)	Pascrell	Hinson	McKinley	Slotkin
Palazzo	Sessions	Valadao	Carson	Jayapal	Payne	Hollingsworth	Meijer	Smith (MO)
Palmer	Simpson	Van Drew	Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Perlmutter	Hudson	Meuser	Smith (NE)
Pence	Smith (MO)	Van Duyn	Cartwright	Peters	Peters	Huizenga	Miller (WV)	Smith (NJ)
Perry	Smith (NE)	Wagner	Case	Johnson (TX)	Phillips	Issa	Miller-Meeks	Smucker
Pfleger	Smith (NJ)	Walorski	Castor (FL)	Jones	Pingree	Jackson	Moolenaar	Spartz
Posey	Smucker	Waltz	Castro (TX)	Kahele	Pocan	Johnson (LA)	Mooney	Staubert
Reschenthaler	Spartz	Weber (TX)	Cherfilus-	Kaptur	Porter	Johnson (OH)	Moore (AL)	Steel
Rice (SC)	Staubert	Webster (FL)	McCormick	Katko	Pressley	Johnson (SD)	Moore (UT)	Stefanik
Rodgers (WA)	Steel	Wenstrup	Chu	Keating	Price (NC)	Jordan	Mullin	Stell
Rogers (AL)	Stefanik	Westerman	Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Quigley	Joyce (OH)	Murphy (NC)	Steube
Rogers (KY)	Steil	Williams (TX)	Clark (MA)	Khanna	Raskin	Joyce (PA)	Nehls	Stewart
Rose	Steube	Wilson (SC)	Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Rice (NY)	Keller	Newhouse	Taylor
Rosendale	Stewart	Wittman	Cleaver	Kilmer	Ross	Kelly (MS)	Norman	Tenney
Rouzer	Taylor	Womack	Clyburn	Kim (NJ)	Roybal-Allard	Kelly (PA)	Obernolte	Thompson (PA)
Roy	Tenney	Zeldin	Cohen	Kind	Ruiz	Kim (CA)	Owens	Tiffany
Rutherford	Thompson (PA)		Connolly	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger	Kinzing	Palazzo	Timmons
Scalise	Tiffany		Cooper	Krishnamoorthi	Rush	Kustoff	Palmer	Turner
			Correa	Kuster	Ryan	LaHood	Pence	Upton
			Costa	Lamb	Sánchez	LaMalfa	Perry	Valadao
			Courtney	Langevin	Sarbanes	Lamborn	Pfleger	Van Drew
			Craig	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon	Latta	Posey	Van Duyn
			Crist	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky	LaTurner	Reschenthaler	Wagner
			Crow	Lawrence	Schiff	Lesko	Rice (SC)	Walberg
			Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Schneider	Letlow	Rodgers (WA)	Walorski
			Dauids (KS)	Lee (CA)	Schrier	Long	Rogers (AL)	Waltz
			Davis, Danny K.	Lee (NV)	Scott (VA)	Loudermilk	Rogers (KY)	Weber (TX)
			Dean	Leger Fernandez	Scott, David	Lucas	Rose	Webster (FL)
			DeFazio	Levin (CA)	Sewell	Luetkemeyer	Rosendale	Wenstrup
			DeGette	Levin (MI)	Sherman	Mace	Rouzer	Westerman
			DeBene	Lieu	Sherrill	Malliotakis	Roy	Wild
			Demings	Lofgren	Sires	Mann	Rutherford	Williams (TX)
			DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)	Massie	Salazar	Wilson (SC)
			Deutch	Luria	Soto	Mast	Scalise	Wittman
			Dingell	Lynch	Spanberger	McCarthy	Schrader	Womack
			Doggett	Malinowski	Speier	McCaul	Schweikert	Zeldin
			Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney	Stansbury	McClain	Scott, Austin	
				Carolyn B.	Stanton	McClintock	Sessions	
			Escobar	Maloney, Sean	Stevens			
			Eshoo	Manning	Strickland			
			Espallat	Matsui	Suozi			
			Evans	McBath	Swalwell			
			Fitzpatrick	McCollum	Takano			
			Fletcher	McEachin	Thompson (CA)			
			Foster	McGovern	Thompson (MS)			
			Frankel, Lois	McNerney	Titus			
			Gallego	Meeks	Tlaib			
			Garamendi	Meng	Tonko			
			Garcia (IL)	Mfume	Torres (CA)			
			Garcia (TX)	Moore (WI)	Torres (NY)			
			Gohmert	Morelle	Trahan			
			Gomez	Moulton	Trone			
			Gonzalez,	Mrvan	Underwood			
			Vicente	Murphy (FL)	Vargas			
			Gottheimer	Nadler	Veasey			
			Green, Al (TX)	Napolitano	Velázquez			
			Grijalva	Neal	Wasserman			
			Harder (CA)	Neguse	Schultz			
			Hayes	Newman	Waters			
			Higgins (NY)	Norcross	Watson Coleman			
			Himes	O'Halleran	Welch			
			Horsford	Ocasio-Cortez	Wexton			
			Houlahan	Omar	Williams (GA)			
			Hoyer	Pallone	Wilson (FL)			
			Huffman	Panetta	Yarmuth			

NOT VOTING—7

Casten	Guest	Miller (IL)
Donalds	Jacobs (CA)	
Estes	Meeks	

□ 1742

Mr. BACON changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Kelly (IL)	Payne (Pallone)
(Balderson)	(Neguse)	Peters (Jeffries)
Bustos (Mrvan)	Khanna (Watson)	Pingree
Carter (TX)	Coleman	(Wasserman)
(Weber (TX))	Lamb (Blunt)	Schultz)
Correa (Huffman)	Rochester)	Price (NC)
Crist	Lawrence	(Manning)
(Wasserman)	(Stevens)	Rice (SC)
Schultz)	Lawson (FL)	(Meijer)
Dauids (KS)	(Wasserman)	Schneider
(Neguse)	Schultz)	(Stevens)
Davis, Danny K.	Lynch	Stanton
(Beyer)	(Langevin)	(Huffman)
Deutch (Rice)	Mace (Carter)	Suozi (Beyer)
(NY)	(GA))	Taylor (Van
Evans (Beyer)	McEachin	Duyn)
Gonzalez (OH)	(Beyer)	Tenney
(Meijer)	Moore (WI)	(Jackson)
Granger (Weber	(Beyer)	Titus (Pallone)
(TX))	Nadler (Pallone)	Walorski
Johnson (GA)	Newman (Beyer)	(Bucshon)
(Manning)	O'Halleran	Waters (Takano)
Johnson (TX)	(Schrader)	Wilson (FL)
(Jeffries)	Palazzo	(Neguse)
Kahele (Mrvan)	(Fleischmann)	

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BUTTERFIELD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 5, printed in part D of House Report 117-366, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 206, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 265]

YEAS—216

Adams	Bera	Boyle, Brendan
Aguilar	Beyer	F.
Allred	Bishop (GA)	Brown (MD)
Auchincloss	Blumenauer	Brown (OH)
Axne	Blunt Rochester	Brownley
Barragán	Bonamici	Bush
Bass	Bourdeaux	Bustos
Beatty	Bowman	Butterfield

NAYS—206

Aderholt	Carter (GA)	Franklin, C.
Allen	Carter (TX)	Scott
Amodei	Cawthorn	Fulcher
Armstrong	Chabot	Gaetz
Arrington	Cheney	Gallagher
Babin	Cline	Garbarino
Bacon	Cloud	Garcia (CA)
Baird	Clyde	Gibbs
Balderson	Cole	Gimenez
Banks	Comer	Golden
Barr	Crawford	Gonzales, Tony
Bentz	Crenshaw	Gonzalez (OH)
Bergman	Curtis	Good (VA)
Bice (OK)	Davidson	Gooden (TX)
Biggs	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Bilirakis	DeLauro	Granger
Bishop (NC)	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
Boebert	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Bost	Donalds	Green (TN)
Brady	Duncan	Greene (GA)
Brooks	Dunn	Griffith
Buchanan	Ellzey	Grothman
Buck	Emmer	Guthrie
Bucshon	Fallon	Harris
Budd	Feenstra	Harshbarger
Burchett	Ferguson	Hartzler
Burgess	Fischbach	Hern
Calvert	Fitzgerald	Herrell
Carmack	Fleischmann	Herrera Beutler
Carey	Fox	Hice (GA)
Carl		Higgins (LA)

NOT VOTING—5

Casten	Guest	Miller (IL)
Estes	Jacobs (CA)	

□ 1750

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Kelly (IL)	Payne (Pallone)
(Balderson)	(Neguse)	Peters (Jeffries)
Bustos (Mrvan)	Khanna (Watson)	Pingree
Carter (TX)	Coleman	(Wasserman)
(Weber (TX))	Lamb (Blunt)	Schultz)
Correa (Huffman)	Rochester)	Price (NC)
Crist	Lawrence	(Manning)
(Wasserman)	(Stevens)	Rice (SC)
Schultz)	Lawson (FL)	(Meijer)
Dauids (KS)	(Wasserman)	Schneider
(Neguse)	Schultz)	(Stevens)
Davis, Danny K.	Lynch	Stanton
(Beyer)	(Langevin)	(Huffman)
Deutch (Rice)	Mace (Carter)	Suozi (Beyer)
(NY)	(GA))	Taylor (Van
Evans (Beyer)	McEachin	Duyn)
Gonzalez (OH)	(Beyer)	Tenney
(Meijer)	Meeks (Jeffries)	(Jackson)
Granger (Weber	Moore (WI)	Titus (Pallone)
(TX))	(Beyer)	Walorski
Johnson (GA)	Nadler (Pallone)	(Bucshon)
(Manning)	Newman (Beyer)	Waters (Takano)
Johnson (TX)	O'Halleran	Wilson (FL)
(Jeffries)	(Schrader)	(Neguse)
Kahele (Mrvan)	Palazzo	
	(Fleischmann)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Fulcher of Idaho moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2773 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Mr. RESCHENTHALER is as follows:

Page 7, line 15, strike “and”.

page 7, line 20, strike the period and insert “; and”.

Page 7, after line 20, insert the following new subparagraph:

“(H) may be used for forest management activities, including mechanical thinning and prescribed burning, where the primary purpose of such activity is to modify, improve, enhance, or create wildlife habitat or reduce the risk of damage or destruction to wildlife habitat due to wildfires, insects, or disease.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 220, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 266]

YEAS—202

Aderholt	Ellzey	Jordan
Allen	Emmer	Joyce (OH)
Amodei	Fallon	Joyce (PA)
Armstrong	Feenstra	Katko
Arrington	Ferguson	Keller
Babin	Fischbach	Kelly (MS)
Bacon	Fitzgerald	Kelly (PA)
Baird	Fitzpatrick	Kim (CA)
Balderson	Fleischmann	Kinzinger
Banks	Foxx	Kustoff
Barr	Franklin, C.	LaMalfa
Bentz	Scott	Lamborn
Bergman	Fulcher	Latta
Bice (OK)	Gaetz	LaTurner
Biggs	Gallagher	Lesko
Billirakis	Garbarino	Letlow
Bishop (NC)	Garcia (CA)	Long
Boebert	Gibbs	Loudermilk
Bost	Gimenez	Lucas
Brady	Gohmert	Luetkemeyer
Brooks	Gonzales, Tony	Mace
Buchanan	Gonzalez (OH)	Malliotakis
Buck	Good (VA)	Mann
Bucshon	Gooden (TX)	Massie
Budd	Gosar	Mast
Burchett	Granger	McCarthy
Burgess	Graves (LA)	McCaul
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McClain
Cammack	Green (TN)	McClintock
Carey	Greene (GA)	McHenry
Carl	Griffith	McKinley
Carter (GA)	Grothman	Meijer
Carter (TX)	Guthrie	Meuser
Cawthorn	Harris	Miller (WV)
Chabot	Harshbarger	Miller-Meeks
Cheney	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Cline	Hern	Mooney
Cloud	Herrell	Moore (AL)
Clyde	Herrera Beutler	Moore (UT)
Cole	Higgins (LA)	Mullin
Comer	Hill	Murphy (NC)
Crawford	Hinson	Nehls
Crenshaw	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Curtis	Hudson	Norman
Davidson	Huizenga	Oberholte
Davis, Rodney	Issa	Owens
DesJarlais	Jackson	Palazzo
Diaz-Balart	Jacobs (NY)	Palmer
Donalds	Johnson (LA)	Pence
Duncan	Johnson (OH)	Perry
Dunn	Johnson (SD)	Pfluger

Posey	Smith (NE)
Reschenthaler	Smith (NJ)
Rice (SC)	Smucker
Rodgers (WA)	Spartz
Rogers (AL)	Stauber
Rogers (KY)	Steel
Rose	Stefanik
Rosendale	Steil
Rouzer	Steube
Rutherford	Stewart
Salazar	Taylor
Scalise	Tenney
Schweikert	Thompson (PA)
Scott, Austin	Tiffany
Sessions	Timmons
Simpson	Turner
Smith (MO)	Upton

NAYS—220

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gonzalez,	Omar
Allred	Vicente	Pallone
Auchincloss	Gottheimer	Panetta
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Barragan	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass	Harder (CA)	Payne
Beatty	Hayes	Perlmutter
Bera	Hice (GA)	Peters
Beyer	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Pingree
Blumenauer	Horsford	Pocan
Blunt Rochester	Houlahan	Porter
Bonamici	Hoyer	Pressley
Bourdeaux	Huffman	Price (NC)
Bowman	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Boyle, Brendan	Jayapal	Raskin
F.	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Brown (MD)	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Brown (OH)	Johnson (TX)	Roy
Brownley	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Bush	Kahele	Ruiz
Bustos	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Keating	Rush
Carbajal	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Cardenas	Khanna	Sanchez
Carson	Kildee	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Kilmer	Scanlon
Cartwright	Kim (NJ)	Schakowsky
Case	Kind	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Krishnamoorthi	Schrader
Cherfilus-	Kuster	Schrier
McCormick	LaHood	Scott (VA)
Chu	Lamb	Scott, David
Cicilline	Langevin	Sewell
Clark (MA)	Clark (WA)	Sherman
Clarke (NY)	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Cleaver	Lawrence	Sires
Clyburn	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Cohen	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Connolly	Lee (NV)	Soto
Cooper	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Correa	Levin (CA)	Speier
Costa	Levin (MI)	Stansbury
Courtney	Lieu	Stanton
Craig	Lofgren	Stevens
Crist	Lowenthal	Strickland
Crow	Luria	Suozzi
Cuellar	Lynch	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	Malinowski	Takano
Davis, Danny K.	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Dean	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Maloney, Sean	Titus
DeGette	Manning	Tlaib
DeLauro	Matsui	Tonko
DelBato	McBath	Torres (CA)
Demings	McCollum	Torres (NY)
DeSaulnier	McEachin	Trahan
Deutsch	McGovern	Trone
Dingell	McNerney	Underwood
Doggett	Meeks	Vargas
Doyle, Michael	Meng	Veasey
F.	Mfume	Velázquez
Escobar	Moore (WI)	Wasserman
Eshoo	Morille	Schultz
Españillat	Moulton	Waters
Evans	Mrvan	Watson Coleman
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Welch
Foster	Nadler	Wexton
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Wild
Gallego	Neal	Williams (GA)
Garamendi	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL)	Newman	Yarmuth
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	
Golden	O'Halleran	

NOT VOTING—5

Casten	Guest	Miller (IL)
Estes	Jacobs (CA)	

□ 1759

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Kelly (IL)	Payne (Pallone)
(Balderson)	(Neguse)	Peters (Jeffries)
Bustos (Mrvan)	Khanna (Watson)	Pingree
Carter (TX)	Coleman	(Wasserman
(Weber (TX))	Lamb (Blunt	Schultz)
Correa (Huffman)	Rochester)	Price (NC)
Crist	Lawrence	(Manning)
(Wasserman	(Stevens)	Rice (SC)
Schultz)	Lawson (FL)	(Meijer)
Davids (KS)	(Wasserman	Schneider
(Neguse)	Schultz)	(Stevens)
Davis, Danny K.	Lynch	Stanton
(Beyer)	(Langevin)	(Huffman)
Deutch (Rice	Mace (Carter	Suozi (Beyer)
(NY))	(GA))	Taylor (Van
Evans (Beyer)	McEachin	Duynne)
(Beyer)	(Beyer)	Tenney
Gonzalez (OH)	Meeks (Jeffries)	(Jackson)
Moore (WI)	(Meijer)	Titus (Pallone)
Granger (Weber	(Beyer)	Walorski
(TX))	Nadler (Pallone)	(Bucshon)
Johnson (GA)	Newman (Beyer)	Waters (Takano)
(Manning)	O'Halleran	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (TX)	(Schrader)	(Neguse)
(Jeffries)	Palazzo	
Kahele (Mrvan)	(Fleischmann)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 190, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 267]

YEAS—231

Adams	Cole	Green, Al (TX)
Aguilar	Connolly	Grijalva
Allred	Cooper	Harder (CA)
Auchincloss	Correa	Hayes
Axne	Costa	Higgins (NY)
Barragan	Courtney	Hill
Bass	Craig	Himes
Beatty	Crist	Horsford
Bera	Crow	Houlahan
Beyer	Cuellar	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	Davids (KS)	Huffman
Blumenauer	Davis, Danny K.	Jackson Lee
Blunt Rochester	Dean	Jacobs (NY)
Bonamici	DeFazio	Jayapal
Bourdeaux	DeGette	Jeffries
Bowman	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Boyle, Brendan	Demings	Johnson (TX)
F.	DeSaulnier	Jones
Brown (MD)	Deutch	Joyce (OH)
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Kahele
Brownley	Doggett	Kaptur
Bush	Doyle, Michael	Katko
Bustos	F.	Keating
Butterfield	Escobar	Kelly (IL)
Carbajal	Eshoo	Khanna
Cardenas	Españillat	Kildee
Carson	Evans	Kilmer
Carter (LA)	Fitzpatrick	Kim (CA)
Cartwright	Fletcher	Kim (NJ)
Case	Foster	Kind
Castor (FL)	Frankel, Lois	Kinzinger
Castro (TX)	Gallego	Kirkpatrick
Cherfilus-	Garamendi	Krishnamoorthi
McCormick	Garbarino	Kuster
Chu	Garcia (IL)	Lamb
Cicilline	Garcia (TX)	Langevin
Clark (MA)	Golden	Larsen (WA)
Clarke (NY)	Gomez	Lawrence
Cleaver	Gonzalez,	Lawson (FL)
Clyburn	Vicente	Lee (CA)
Cohen	Gottheimer	Lee (NV)

Leger Fernandez Omar
 Levin (CA) Pallone
 Levin (MI) Panetta
 Lieu Pappas
 Lofgren Pascarell
 Lowenthal Payne
 Luria Perlmutter
 Lynch Peters
 Malinowski Phillips
 Maloney, Carolyn B. Pingree
 Maloney, Sean Pocan
 Manning Porter
 Matsui Pressley
 McBath Price (NC)
 McCaul Quigley
 McCollum Raskin
 McEachin Rice (NY)
 McGovern Ross
 McKinley Roybal-Allard
 McNerney Ruiz
 Meeks Ruppertsberger
 Meijer Rush
 Meng Ryan
 Mfume Salazar
 Moore (WI) Sánchez
 Morelle Sarbanes
 Moulton Scanlon
 Mrvan Schakowsky
 Murphy (FL) Schiff
 Nadler Schneider
 Napolitano Schrader
 Neal Schrier
 Neguse Scott (VA)
 Newman Scott, David
 Norcross Sewell
 O'Halleran Sherman
 Ocasio-Cortez Sherrill
 Simpson

NAYS—190

Aderholt Foxx
 Allen Franklin, C.
 Amodei Scott
 Armstrong Fulcher
 Arrington Gaetz
 Babin Gallagher
 Bacon Garcia (CA)
 Baird Gibbs
 Balderson Gimenez
 Banks Gohmert
 Barr Gonzales, Tony
 Bentz Gonzalez (OH)
 Bergman Good (VA)
 Bice (OK) Gooden (TX)
 Biggs Gosar
 Bilirakis Granger
 Bishop (NC) Graves (LA)
 Boebert Graves (MO)
 Bost Green (TN)
 Brady Greene (GA)
 Brooks Griffith
 Buchanan Grothman
 Buck Guthrie
 Bucshon Harris
 Budd Harshbarger
 Burchett Hartzler
 Burgess Hern
 Calvert Herrell
 Cammack Herrera Beutler
 Carey Hice (GA)
 Carl Higgins (LA)
 Carter (GA) Hinson
 Carter (TX) Hollingsworth
 Cawthorn Hudson
 Chabot Huizenga
 Cheney Issa
 Cline Jackson
 Cloud Johnson (LA)
 Clyde Johnson (OH)
 Comer Johnson (SD)
 Crawford Jordan
 Crenshaw Joyce (PA)
 Curtis Keller
 Davidson Kelly (MS)
 Davis, Rodney Kelly (PA)
 DeLauro Kustoff
 DesJarlais LaHood
 Diaz-Balart LaMalfa
 Donalds Lamborn
 Duncan Larson (CT)
 Dunn Latta
 Ellzey LaTurner
 Emmer Lesko
 Fallon Letlow
 Feenstra Long
 Ferguson Loudermilk
 Fischbach Lucas
 Fitzgerald Luetkemeyer
 Fleischmann Mace

Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (WA) Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stansbury
 Stanton
 Stevens
 Strickland
 Suozzi
 Swallow
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres (NY)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood
 Upton
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Velázquez
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Williams (GA)
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Van Duyne
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walorski
 Waltz

Casten
 Estes

Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams (TX)

NOT VOTING—6

Guest
 Jacobs (CA)

Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Zeldin

Burchett
 Bush
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Calvert
 Cammack
 Carbajal
 Cárdenas
 Carey
 Carl
 Carson
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (LA)
 Carter (TX)
 Cartwright
 Case
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cherfilus-McCormick
 Chu
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Cleaver
 Cline
 Cloud
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Cole
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Craig
 Crawford
 Crenshaw
 Crist
 Crow
 Cuellar
 Curtis
 Davids (KS)
 Davidson
 Davis, Danny K.
 Davis, Rodney
 Dean
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 DesJarlais
 Deutch
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Duncan
 Dunn
 Ellzey
 Emmer
 Escobar
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Evans
 Fallon
 Feenstra
 Ferguson
 Fischbach
 Fitzgerald
 Fitzpatrick
 Fleischmann
 Fletcher
 Foster
 Foxx
 Frankel, Lois
 Franklin, C.
 Scott
 Gallagher
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Garbarino
 Garcia (CA)
 Garcia (IL)
 Garcia (TX)
 Gibbs
 Golden
 Gomez
 Gonzales, Tony
 Gonzalez (OH)
 Gonzalez,
 Vicente
 Gottheimer
 Granger
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)

Green (TN)
 Green, Al (TX)
 Griffith
 Grijalva
 Guthrie
 Harder (CA)
 Hartzler
 Hayes
 Herrell
 Herrera Beutler
 Higgins (LA)
 Higgins (NY)
 Hill
 Himes
 Hinson
 Hollingsworth
 Horsford
 Houlahan
 Hoyer
 Hudson
 Huffman
 Huizenga
 Issa
 Jackson
 Jackson Lee
 Jacobs (NY)
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD)
 Johnson (TX)
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Kafele
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Keller
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 Khanna
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kim (CA)
 Kim (NJ)
 Kind
 Kirkpatrick
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster
 Kustoff
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamb
 Lamborn
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latta
 LaTurner
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee (CA)
 Lee (NV)
 Leger Fernandez
 Lesko
 Letlow
 Levin (CA)
 Levin (MI)
 Lieu
 Lofgren
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Lowenthal
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Luria
 Lynch
 Mace
 Malliotakis
 Maloney, Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Mann
 Manning
 Mast
 Matsui
 McBath
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClain
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McHenry

McKinley
 McNerney
 Meeks
 Meijer
 Meng
 Meuser
 Mfume
 Miller (WV)
 Miller-Meeks
 Moonenar
 Mooney
 Moore (AL)
 Moore (UT)
 Moore (WI)
 Morelle
 Moulton
 Mrvan
 Mullin
 Murphy (FL)
 Murphy (NC)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Neguse
 Newhouse
 Newman
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 Obernolte
 Ocasio-Cortez
 Omar
 Owens
 Palazzo
 Pallone
 Palmer
 Panetta
 Pappas
 Payne
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pfluger
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Rodgers (WA)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rose
 Ross
 Rouzer
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Salazar
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Schweikert
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sessions
 Sewell
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spartz
 Speier
 Stansbury
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Steel
 Stefanik

So the bill was passed.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
 Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I was recorded as “nay,” but I intended to vote “yea” on roll-call No. 267.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei Kelly (IL)
 (Balderson) (Neguse)
 Bustos (Mrvan) Khanna (Watson)
 Carter (TX) Coleman
 (Weber (TX)) Lamb (Blunt)
 Correa (Huffman) Rochester
 Crist Lawrence
 (Wasserman) (Stevens)
 Schultz Lawson (FL)
 Davids (KS) (Wasserman)
 (Neguse) Schultz
 Davis, Danny K. Lynch
 (Beyer) (Langevin)
 Deutch (Rice) Mace (Carter)
 (NY) (GA)
 Evans (Beyer) McEachin
 Gonzalez (OH) (Beyer)
 (Meijer) Meeks (Jeffries)
 Granger (Weber) Moore (WI)
 (TX) (Beyer)
 Johnson (GA) Nadler (Pallone)
 (Manning) Newman (Beyer)
 Johnson (TX) O'Halleran
 (Jeffries) (Schrader)
 Kahele (Mrvan) Palazzo
 (Fleischmann)

ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY COORDINATION AND LEADERSHIP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 516) to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility aircraft into the national airspace system, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFALZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 380, nays 30, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 268]

YEAS—380

Adams
 Aderholt
 Aguilar
 Allen
 Allred
 Amodei
 Armstrong
 Arrington
 Auchincloss
 Axne
 Babin
 Bacon
 Baird
 Balderson
 Barr
 Barragán
 Bass
 Beatty
 Bentz
 Bera
 Bergman
 Beyer
 Bice (OK)
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Bost
 Bourdeaux
 Bowman
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady
 Brown (MD)
 Brown (OH)
 Brownley
 Buchanan
 Bucshon

Payne (Pallone)
 Peters (Jeffries)
 Pingree
 (Wasserman)
 Schultz
 Price (NC)
 (Manning)
 Rice (SC)
 (Meijer)
 Schneider
 (Stevens)
 Stanton
 (Huffman)
 Suozzi (Beyer)
 Taylor (Van
 Dwyne)
 Tenney
 (Jackson)
 Titus (Pallone)
 Walorski
 (Bucshon)
 Waters (Takano)
 Wilson (FL)
 (Neguse)

Steil	Trahan	Waters
Stevens	Trone	Watson Coleman
Stewart	Turner	Weber (TX)
Strickland	Underwood	Webster (FL)
Suozi	Upton	Welch
Swalwell	Valadao	Wenstrup
Takano	Van Drew	Westerman
Tenney	Van Duyne	Wexton
Thompson (CA)	Vargas	Wild
Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Williams (GA)
Thompson (PA)	Velázquez	Williams (TX)
Timmons	Wagner	Wilson (FL)
Titus	Walberg	Wilson (SC)
Tlaib	Walorski	Wittman
Tonko	Waltz	Womack
Torres (CA)	Wasserman	Zeldin
Torres (NY)	Schultz	

NAYS—30

Banks	Gohmert	Massie
Biggs	Good (VA)	McClintock
Boebert	Gooden (TX)	Nehls
Brooks	Gosar	Norman
Buck	Greene (GA)	Perry
Burgess	Grothman	Rosendale
Cawthorn	Harris	Roy
Clyde	Harshbarger	Slotkin
Comer	Hern	Steube
Gaetz	Hice (GA)	Taylor

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (NC)	Estes	Malinowski
Budd	Fulcher	Miller (IL)
Casten	Gimenez	Pascarell
Donalds	Guest	Sires
Doyle, Michael F.	Jacobs (CA)	Tiffany
	Kinzinger	Yarmuth

□ 1814

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Kelly (IL)	Payne (Pallone)
(Balderson)	(Neguse)	Peters (Jeffries)
Bustos (Mrvan)	Khanna (Watson)	Pingree
Carter (TX)	Coleman	(Wasserman)
(Weber (TX))	Lamb (Blunt)	Schultz
Correa (Huffman)	Rochester	Price (NC)
Crist	Lawrence	(Manning)
(Wasserman)	(Stevens)	Rice (SC)
Schultz	Lawson (FL)	(Meijer)
David (KS)	(Wasserman)	Schneider
(Neguse)	Schultz	(Stevens)
Davis, Danny K.	Lynch	Stanton
(Beyer)	(Langevin)	(Huffman)
Deutch (Rice)	Mace (Carter)	Suozi (Beyer)
(NY)	(GA))	Taylor (Van)
Evans (Beyer)	McEachin	Duyne)
Gonzalez (OH)	(Beyer)	Tenney
(Meijer)	Meeks (Jeffries)	(Jackson)
Granger (Weber)	Moore (WI)	Titus (Pallone)
(TX))	(Beyer)	Walorski
Johnson (GA)	Nadler (Pallone)	(Bucshon)
(Manning)	Newman (Beyer)	Waters (Takano)
Johnson (TX)	O'Halleran	Wilson (FL)
(Jeffries)	(Schrader)	(Neguse)
Kahele (Mrvan)	Palazzo	(Fleischmann)

SMALL STATE AND RURAL RESCUE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7211) to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, review a final rule of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 396, nays 14, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—396

Adams	Curtis	Jackson
Aderholt	David (KS)	Jackson Lee
Aguilar	Davidson	Jacobs (NY)
Allen	Davis, Danny K.	Jayapal
Allred	Davis, Rodney	Jeffries
Amodei	Dean	Johnson (GA)
Armstrong	DeFazio	Johnson (LA)
Arrington	DeGette	Johnson (OH)
Auchincloss	DeLauro	Johnson (SD)
Axne	DelBene	Johnson (TX)
Babin	Demings	Jones
Bacon	DeSaulnier	Joyce (OH)
Baird	DesJarlais	Joyce (PA)
Balderson	Deutch	Kahele
Banks	Diaz-Balart	Kaptur
Barr	Dingell	Katko
Barragán	Doggett	Keating
Bass	Donalds	Keller
Beatty	Duncan	Kelly (IL)
Bentz	Dunn	Kelly (MS)
Bera	Ellzey	Kelly (PA)
Bergman	Emmer	Khanna
Beyer	Escobar	Kildee
Bice (OK)	Eshoo	Kilmer
Bilirakis	Espallat	Kim (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Kim (NJ)
Blumenauer	Fallon	Kind
Blunt Rochester	Feenstra	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	Ferguson	Krishnamoorthi
Bost	Fischbach	Kuster
Bourdeaux	Fitzgerald	Kustoff
Bowman	Fitzpatrick	LaHood
Boyle, Brendan F.	Fleischmann	LaMalfa
Brady	Fletcher	Lamb
Brown (MD)	Foster	Lamborn
Brown (OH)	Fox	Langevin
Brownley	Frankel, Lois	Larsen (WA)
Buchanan	Franklin, C.	Larson (CT)
Buck	Scott	Latta
Bucshon	Fulcher	LaTurner
Burchett	Gaetz	Lawrence
Burgess	Gallagher	Lawson (FL)
Bush	Gallo	Lee (CA)
Bustos	Garamendi	Lee (NV)
Butterfield	Garbarino	Leger Fernandez
Calvert	Garcia (CA)	Lesko
Cammack	Garcia (IL)	Letlow
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	Levin (CA)
Cárdenas	Gibbs	Levin (MI)
Carey	Gimenez	Lieu
Carl	Gohmert	Lofgren
Carson	Golden	Long
Carter (GA)	Gomez	Loudermilk
Carter (LA)	Gonzales, Tony	Lowenthal
Carter (TX)	Gonzalez (OH)	Lucas
Cartwright	Gonzalez,	Luetkemeyer
Case	Vicente	Luria
Castor (FL)	Gooden (TX)	Lynch
Castro (TX)	Gottheimer	Mace
Chabot	Granger	Malinowski
Cheney	Graves (MO)	Malliotakis
Chefilus-	Green (TN)	Maloney,
McCormick	Green, Al (TX)	Carolyn B.
Chu	Griffith	Maloney, Sean
Cicilline	Grijalva	Mann
Clark (MA)	Grothman	Manning
Clarke (NY)	Guthrie	Mast
Cleaver	Harder (CA)	Matsui
Cline	Harris	McBath
Cloud	Harshbarger	McCarthy
Clyburn	Hartzler	McCaul
Cohen	Hayes	McClain
Cole	Hern	McClintock
Comer	Herrell	McCollum
Connolly	Herrera Beutler	McEachin
Cooper	Higgins (LA)	McGovern
Correa	Higgins (NY)	McHenry
Costa	Hill	McKinley
Courtney	Hinson	McNerney
Craig	Hollingsworth	Meeks
Crawford	Horsford	Meijer
Crenshaw	Houlahan	Meng
Crist	Hoyer	Meuser
Crow	Hudson	Mfume
Cuellar	Huffman	Miller (WV)
	Huizenga	Miller-Meeks
	Issa	Moolenaar

Mooney	Rose	Suozi
Moore (AL)	Ross	Swalwell
Moore (UT)	Rouzer	Takano
Moore (WI)	Roybal-Allard	Taylor
Morelle	Ruiz	Tenney
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Mrvan	Rush	Thompson (MS)
Mullin	Rutherford	Thompson (PA)
Murphy (FL)	Ryan	Timmons
Murphy (NC)	Salazar	Titus
Nadler	Sánchez	Tlaib
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Tonko
Neal	Scalise	Torres (CA)
Neguse	Scanlon	Torres (NY)
Nehls	Schakowsky	Trahan
Newhouse	Schiff	Trone
Newman	Schneider	Turner
Norcross	Schrader	Underwood
O'Halleran	Schrier	Upton
Oberholte	Scott (VA)	Valadao
Ocasio-Cortez	Scott, Austin	Van Drew
Omar	Scott, David	Van Duyne
Owens	Sessions	Vargas
Palazzo	Sewell	Veasey
Pallone	Sherman	Velázquez
Palmer	Sherrill	Wagner
Panetta	Simpson	Walberg
Pappas	Slotkin	Walorski
Payne	Smith (MO)	Waltz
Pence	Smith (NE)	Wasserman
Perlmutter	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Peters	Smith (WA)	Waters
Pfizer	Smucker	Watson Coleman
Phillips	Soto	Weber (TX)
Pingree	Spanberger	Webster (FL)
Pocan	Spartz	Welch
Porter	Speier	Wenstrup
Pressley	Stansbury	Westerman
Price (NC)	Stanton	Wexton
Quigley	Staubert	Wild
Raskin	Steel	Williams (GA)
Reschenthaler	Stefanik	Williams (TX)
Rice (NY)	Steil	Wilson (FL)
Rice (SC)	Steube	Wilson (SC)
Rodgers (WA)	Stevens	Wittman
Rogers (AL)	Stewart	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Strickland	Zeldin

NAYS—14

Biggs	Hice (GA)	Posey
Boebert	Jordan	Rosendale
Clyde	Massie	Roy
Good (VA)	Norman	Schweikert
Gosar	Perry	

NOT VOTING—17

Bishop (NC)	Estes	Kinzinger
Brooks	Graves (LA)	Miller (IL)
Budd	Greene (GA)	Pascarell
Casten	Guest	Sires
Doyle, Michael F.	Himes	Tiffany
	Jacobs (CA)	Yarmuth

□ 1822

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "NAY" on rollcall No. 262, "YEA" on rollcall No. 263, "NAY" on rollcall No. 264, "NAY" on rollcall No. 265, "YEA" on rollcall No. 266, "NAY" on rollcall No. 267, "YEA" on rollcall No. 268, and "YEA" on rollcall No. 269.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Amodei	Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (TX)
(Balderson)	(Beyer)	(Jeffries)
Bustos (Mrvan)	Deutch (Rice)	Kahele (Mrvan)
Carter (TX)	(NY)	Kelly (IL)
(Weber (TX))	Evans (Beyer)	(Neguse)
Correa (Huffman)	Gonzalez (OH)	Khanna (Watson)
Crist	(Meijer)	Coleman
(Wasserman)	Granger (Weber)	Lamb (Blunt)
Schultz	(TX))	Rochester
David (KS)	Johnson (GA)	Lawrence
(Neguse)	(Manning)	(Stevens)

Lawson (FL)	O'Halleran	Stanton
(Wasserman	(Schrader)	(Huffman)
Schultz)	Palazzo	Suozi (Beyer)
Lynch	(Fleischmann)	Taylor (Van
(Langevin)	Payne (Pallone)	Duyn)
Mace (Carter	Peters (Jeffries)	Tenney
(GA))	Pingree	(Jackson)
McEachin	(Wasserman	Titus (Pallone)
(Beyer)	Schultz)	Walorski
Meeks (Jeffries)	Price (NC)	(Bucshon)
Moore (WI)	(Manning)	Waters (Takano)
(Beyer)	Rice (SC)	Wilson (FL)
Nadler (Pallone)	(Meijer)	(Neguse)
Newman (Beyer)	Schneider	
	(Stevens)	

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 14, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a letter received from Ms. Jana M. Lean, Chief, Elections Division, California Secretary of State, indicating that, according to the preliminary results for the Special General Election held June 7, 2022, the Honorable Connie Conway was elected for Representative to Congress for the Twenty-Second Congressional District, State of California.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE,
Sacramento, CA, June 14, 2022.

Hon. CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. JOHNSON: This is to advise you that as of June 13, 2022, at 4:59 p.m., the State of California has an estimated 2,240,611 unprocessed ballots and together the counties of Fresno and Tulare have an estimated 53,610 unprocessed ballots. The U.S. House of Representative 22nd District encompasses the counties of Fresno and Tulare.

As of June 13, 2022, at 4:59 p.m. the unofficial results of the Special General Election held on Tuesday, June 7, 2022, for U.S. House of Representative 22nd District show that Connie Conway received 55,169 votes or 61.5% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

According to the unofficial results, it appears that Connie Conway has received the majority of votes cast for the U.S. House of Representative 22nd District of California.

To the best of the Secretary of State's knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by the registrar of voters for the counties of Fresno and Tulare, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

JANA M. LEAN,
CHIEF, ELECTIONS DIVISION,
California Secretary of State.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE CONNIE CONWAY, OF CALI- FORNIA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gen-

tlewoman from California, the Honorable CONNIE CONWAY, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the California delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise and the Representative-elect will please raise her right hand.

Ms. CONWAY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 117th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE CONNIE CONWAY TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, on behalf of my California colleagues and the House of Representatives, I welcome Representative CONNIE CONWAY to Congress.

A lifelong San Joaquin Valley resident, Representative CONWAY has served as a businesswoman, healthcare worker, Tulare County supervisor, president of the California State Association of Counties, and director of the National Association of Counties.

From 2008 to 2014, she served in the California State Assembly. During her tenure she also served as the Assembly minority leader.

In 2019, Representative CONWAY was appointed to the USDA Farm Service Agency as the California executive director.

In that role, she administered more than \$100 million in safety net and disaster relief programs serving California farmers, ranchers, foresters, and agricultural producers.

Representative CONWAY previously operated her own consulting business and comes with experience in the healthcare sector—previously working for the Women's Health Department at Tulare District Hospital and coordinating a wellness program for Visalia's Kaweah Health Medical Center.

We look forward to working with Representative CONWAY.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

□ 1830

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE CONNIE CONWAY

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to welcome now Representative CONNIE CONWAY as the newest Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Congresswoman CONWAY is a proud, lifelong resident of California's San Joaquin Valley. She has dedicated the better part of her life to public service as a county supervisor, a legislator in the California State Assembly, and as the California Executive Director of the USDA's Farm Service Agency. The constituents in California's 22nd District stand to benefit from Congresswoman CONWAY's vast experience and dedication.

I congratulate the entire CONWAY family on this exciting occasion, including CONNIE's husband, Craig; her children; and, of course, we can't leave out her black lab, Jake.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the dean of the California delegation, Ms. LOFGREN, to introduce our new colleague.

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, I would like to now welcome our newest Representative to the podium.

Madam Speaker, I yield to Representative CONWAY.

Ms. CONWAY. Actually, Jake wanted to come, so did my husband, and he wasn't able to make it.

I want to thank him; my sons, Anthony and Tim; and my grandchildren, Caine and Autrey, for their constant, loving support. I hope to make them all proud. As an aside, my grandson, Caine, tomorrow will be 16.

He told me: Nonnie, I can't go watch because I have had an appointment at the DMV for 6 months. I am getting my license, and I am not giving it up.

So all I have to say to that is: Watch out Tillamook, he is off the tractor and onto the roads.

I stand before you today and vow to give everything I have to be the capable and zealous Representative that my constituents deserve. I often look to the words of Luke and paraphrase: To whom much is given, much is expected. I take these words to heart in the role that has been entrusted to me: to honestly, loyally, and passionately represent my constituents in the United States House of Representatives.

I accept this charge with deep humility. My constituents, the great people of California's 22nd District, are facing water shortages, rising inflation, and many other trials not of their own making. Their pain is my pain. Their concerns are my concerns. I stand shoulder to shoulder with them.

As a daughter of the Central Valley and a lifelong fighter for our values, it

is my duty to ensure that our voices are heard in Congress. As your Representative, you have my commitment that my door will always be open to those seeking to make the Central Valley a better place. I look forward to serving with you.

Madam Speaker, I close my remarks with a local colloquial saying: Go Dogs, Win the Mountain West.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. In light of the administration of the oath to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. CONWAY), the whole number of the House is now 429.

AMERICAN SOLAR

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration abandoning tariffs on imported solar companies is terrible.

What is the administration's strategy to protect American companies and American workers who are going to be harmed?

First Solar and Solar Toledo, Ohio, two companies whose products are unrivaled anywhere on Earth, are at risk with thousands of workers' jobs on the line.

These firms employ hardworking Ohioans earning living wages that support themselves and their families, and it is unacceptable to allow China to lay waste to American industries. China has violated the rules and tilted the playing field in its favor. Our workers are sick of it.

I have introduced a bill to create an office of manufacturing within the White House to champion good jobs in the USA. This bipartisan bill would ensure there is an explicit, long-term plan to grow American manufacturing industries and unleash our full manufacturing potential.

Domestic manufacturing is the backbone of our region's middle class, and it is time the Federal Government recognizes it.

Enough is enough. Let America's workers succeed.

HONORING DR. JAMES EMMETT "JIMMY" DUCEY, SR., D.V.M.

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Dr. James Emmett "Jimmy" Ducey, Sr., a veteran, a veterinarian, and an exceptional Georgian.

Jimmy was born in Savannah in 1934, the youngest of four children, and spent his entire youth in the State of Georgia. He then went on to graduate from Savannah High School and at-

tended the University of Georgia where he earned his doctorate in veterinarian medicine.

In 1959 Jimmy and his wife moved to Fort Hood, Texas, where Jimmy served in the U.S. Army as a veterinarian. In 1960, Jimmy returned to Savannah and took over his father's veterinarian practice where he continued to serve his community for 60 years.

Jimmy eventually retired from the Army, achieving the rank of major. Jimmy founded and coached the Wilmington Island Cardinals baseball, soccer, and football teams, winning multiple city championships in soccer.

Thankfully, Jimmy was able to see the University of Georgia win their third national championship before his passing.

A loving father and husband, a veterinarian, a veteran, and fellow Georgia sports fan, Jimmy is sure to be missed.

BOOSTING SCIENCE-BASED CONSERVATION EFFORTS

(Ms. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's populations of fish and wildlife are dwindling. To save threatened and endangered species, we need the bipartisan Recovering America's Wildlife Act which will boost science-based conservation efforts.

The United Nations has warned the world that human actions will continue to drive plant and animal species to extinction if we do not act. In my home State of California, native species have declined by 20 percent, and over 600 species risk extinction.

As a member of the House of Representatives Natural Resources Committee, I have learned from scientists and advocacy groups that we need dedicated funding to recover and sustain healthy populations of threatened and endangered species.

Importantly, protecting these species is good for our economy. Wildlife-focused recreation generates \$140 billion annually. The Recovering America's Wildlife Act will sustain biodiversity, create jobs, and protect our planet.

FLAG DAY AND THE U.S. ARMY'S 247TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today is Flag Day and the U.S. Army's 247th birthday.

Every year on June 14 we celebrate our Stars and Stripes. We celebrate on June 14 because on this day in 1777 the Continental Congress approved the design for our first flag.

Over the years our flag has been changed to reflect the growth of our Nation, but one thing remains the same: It will always stand for freedom.

Our flag is a glorious symbol of hope for our brave servicemen and -women who salute it, defend it, serve it, and, in some cases, die to protect our freedom and liberty.

Today is also the U.S. Army's birthday. For the last 247 years, our servicemembers have been defending freedom at home and abroad.

Today, our Nation celebrates our Army and our flag, which symbolize both America being the land of the free and the home of the brave.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SYLVIA SASS, THE FIRST LADY OF SISTER CITIES INTERNATIONAL

(Ms. STRICKLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Sylvia Sass, an extraordinary public servant and community leader in the State of Washington.

Sylvia was a vital player in the early development of the Sister Cities International organization. She was even appointed Washington State coordinator due to her work in helping President Dwight Eisenhower rebuild international ties, and she was selected as a delegate to have lunch with him.

In 2017, Sylvia received the Sister Cities International Lifetime Achievement Award, and to this day she remains an active and honorary board member of the organization. Sylvia Sass is known as the first lady of Sister Cities International.

Mr. Speaker, Sylvia exemplifies hard work, perseverance, and selfless service to others. I am proud to call her my friend, and I offer these remarks in her honor.

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE SECURITY

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, the United States is a nation of laws, not mob rule. Whoever leaked a draft opinion of *Dobbs v. Jackson* broke the law and did great damage to the integrity of our judicial institutions.

In the 5 weeks following the leak, protesters have taken to the streets of Justices' homes to intimidate and harass them for fulfilling their constitutional duty to interpret the law, and even one deranged individual plotted to assassinate Justice Kavanaugh.

Because of this, I am dumbfounded by the Speaker's refusal on three separate occasions to allow a vote to provide protections for the Justices and their families.

Finally, more than 1 month after the Senate passed the bill by unanimous consent, we were able to hold a vote today. It took way too long, but, thankfully, it wasn't too late.

OUR SLUMBERING PRESS CORPS

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the talk of everyone back home is over inflation. I want to give the press corps something to do. We are told the current inflation rate is 8.2 percent, the highest it has been in 40 years. I believe the number is higher than that.

They claim that the cost of rent or the cost to buy a house has gone up 5.2 percent. I have talked to builders in which the cost of identical homes has gone up 30 percent.

Interest rates have gone up from 2.5 to 4.5 percent. I know somebody who is looking to perhaps flip a house that has gone up 20 percent.

I would like the press corps in this country to look for examples of housing that has only gone up 5.2 percent.

The other thing I would like them to look up is used cars have gone up 16 percent. I have talked to car dealers, and they tell me the price of used cars has gone up 25 to 35 percent.

So I beg the somewhat slumbering press corps to look into this and see whether our leg is being pulled by the claim that the CPI is only up 8.2 percent.

□ 1845

EFFECTS OF INFLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to try to do a continuation on a theme. Last week, I came to the floor and sort of walked through what inflation was doing to seniors. Today, I am going to try to walk through what it is doing to the poor, the working poor, the middle class, all of society.

One of the difficult things I am going to do, and I know it is somewhat rhetorical, is ask my brothers and sisters on the left: Are you happy with what you have accomplished?

Democrats took, functionally, power here 15 months ago. They had the House, the Senate, and they took the White House. And we got to see the playbook.

This is important because we often are so busy chasing shiny objects here, we never sort of talk about some of the economic differences and the way the left and those of us on the right view the world.

The left sort of believes in this model of consumption. Send people checks, and they will go buy stuff and, somehow, that will make society utopian. Of course, it also sets off really bad societal problems like: "Hey, I have money. I don't have to participate in society and the economy." "Hey, I have money. Let's just go buy stuff today," and it sets off inflation.

Those of us who actually showed up to our economics classes, we believe in this concept—it is often referred to as supply side. It is much more complicated. That is productivity in a society, when you are going to pay someone more money, when a worker is paid more money, it is, functionally, from two things: inflation, which doesn't mean they got anywhere. As a matter of fact, when you raise someone's salary because of inflation, they are often always behind the curve.

The second part is productivity. There was investment in plants and equipment to be more productive, to have that newest, best, functional product. That is a supply-side model. That is, functionally, what we accomplished in tax reform.

The other challenge I will give to our friends on the Democrat side is, take a look at our couple of years when we did regulatory reform, when we did tax reform, 2018, 2019. The middle class got much wealthier. Income inequality shrank. Food insecurity shrank. Minority populations had their best economic period in the modern economic time.

I would visit the homeless shelter in downtown Phoenix, and St. Joseph the Worker had a list of businesses that were desperate for anyone who would just show up.

Now, the contrast: The Democrats took over, and, functionally, 15 months ago, they moved \$1.9 trillion of spending. I have been to the floor multiple times. I have shown you all the charts saying, isn't it fascinating that almost on the day you did this, you can actually see actual, functional, price changes in the wholesale markets? You can actually see the curve going: Hey, they passed a bill; there is inflation.

Now, some of that is not completely fair because some of it was actually already built into the policy sets the Democrats had adopted.

When they blew up the capital stack, meaning when the Biden administration took over, and they had a compliant Democrat Congress and a Democrat Senate and, particularly, the left controlling the House of Representatives, when they threatened capital markets for investing in hydrocarbons, when they threatened capital markets for investing in the transportation of hydrocarbons, moving natural gas—oh, you are going to build a pipeline. We are going to do everything so that you have to report to the SEC. We are going to basically make it so the companies, the investors in this, have to do documentation of their environmental scores.

You wonder why September a year ago you actually looked at the futures markets and saw it was already beginning—natural gas, crude prices. So, the horrible prices you are paying today at the pump, it is not because of the Russian invasion of Ukraine. That just moved it forward. This was already built into the Democrats' policy set.

Let's actually focus on something that is the derivative, that is the next

level over from last week's. Last week, we focused substantially on what the left's policies were going to do to seniors, how many of them will be in poverty a decade from now because of inflation today.

But let's actually sort of talk through inflation through the economy because my fear is we do the headline discussion. Hey, did you see the number last week? It was 8.6. My community, it is 11 something. I happen to live in number one or number two, the Scottsdale-Phoenix area, inflation in the Nation.

But what does it actually mean? It is much more than the little number you saw saying, "Hey, last month it was this." It is: What did it do to your retirement a decade from now? What did it do to your kids' and your grandkids' ability to ever purchase a house, to ever build up savings, when every single day their savings become worth less?

There is a reason inflation is the bogeyman. It is because it functionally is government. You have a government with debt the size of our economy, and we are out there taxing all of you. Whether you understand it or not, that is the scam of inflation. This is what the Democrats have set up.

Every single day, your savings becomes less, but also, the value of that massive debt the United States has becomes less because we are transferring your wealth. We are, functionally, devaluing your savings and then devaluing our debt because it is being paid for by inflated dollars.

I don't believe it is purposeful, but now that they have set it off, I promise you, there are economists in this government who basically look the other way and say let it run this way for a couple of years.

Think about it. The actual value of the debt, in constant dollars, stays the same, but—well, excuse me. It decreases because the dollar value has changed dramatically.

It is cruel. It is crushing. And the economic violence that the Democrats' failure to understand basic economics has done to the poor, the working poor, the middle class—please, just stop hurting people. It is math.

Let's take a look at this. We all got the May number, and we saw the price increases, the PCE. But when you started to look at the Consumer Price Index, 8.6—now, do you happen to remember before May, April, March, "Oh, we have hit peak inflation." That is absolute crap.

Structurally, how many of you have actually looked at the gas pump this month? Have you seen where gas prices are? Put that as a factor in the inflation and tell me that prices are going down, that prices have stabilized.

There is an argument out there that we have hit a plateau. It just happens to be an outrageously high plateau. I don't see it yet.

We are in, functionally, what you call a wage-price spiral right now. I

was made fun of about 3, 4 months ago when I came here and said that I think we are on the cusp of a wage-price spiral. Well, guess what? I was right.

What is a wage-price spiral? A business raises its prices. Well, for my workers to be able to afford things, we need to raise their wages. But if we raise their wages, well, we have to raise our prices. Well, if we raise our prices, you raise your wages. It is the puppy chasing its tail.

Right now, the only solution the left is offering, the only solution the Biden administration is offering, is to let the Federal Reserve break people's backs. Raise interest rates enough. Pull liquidity out of the market. Break their backs. Put people in the unemployment lines. That will slow it down.

The cruelty of what has gone on here—and there are other solutions. I have been here to the floor multiple times saying there are things we can do tax policy-wise, incentives to save, other things that would be great for retirement security, great for growing the economy, and would help. It doesn't solve the Federal Reserve's problems, but it would help.

The problem is, I would need my brothers and sisters on the Democrat side to basically open up an economics book and say: Yes, maybe making more stuff, maybe becoming more productive, would be good for society, and it would be good for pushing down inflation.

But God knows, the way the Democrats run this place, I can't even get an amendment in the Ways and Means Committee anymore, assuming they would actually hold a real hearing.

This place is nothing but virtue signaling anymore, but it is a virtue signaling that—if they would actually talk about what they have done to people.

The hits keep coming. You start to look—and I know some of these charts are noisy. One of the tough things about talking about this right now is, these numbers have been moving so fast, trying to make sure you are using credible, third-party sources so you are just not making up numbers out of your own office and building a pretty chart, but you go out and find the experts. The experts can't keep up with the movement of the prices, the economic distortion that is going on.

Part of my challenge is: Go look at your 401(k) right now. Are you happy?

Now, you need to add in also that the fact of the matter is the money you have in there is substantially worth less than a year ago. So it is not that your savings, your investments, have crashed. Also, it is buying about 10 percent less stuff anyway, so you needed to discount rate that.

You understand that we have real negative interest rates right now. That is one of the reasons the Federal Reserve is probably going to have to jack up rates dramatically more than the talking heads are telling you on cable finance news.

Think about it. If you are living in a country where the interest rate—let's just use 10. It is an easy number. I know the number was 8.6. In my community, it is probably 11.

Federal funds rates, let's do a 10-year. Let's use 3½. Do you see that gap there? That is actually negative. You invest in a 10-year T bill, a 10-year U.S. sovereign instrument. You just lost all that.

The model basically says the Federal Reserve is going to have to jack up interest rates to close that gap. And be scared. Be scared.

I have been here on the floor with charts before that basically said if the mean interest rate is 2 points higher on U.S. sovereign debt for, like, 25 years, at the end of that 25 years, every dime of tax receipts, every dime of tax revenue, goes to just interest.

Do you understand the scale of the dystopian misery that the Democrats' economic policy has set off?

Yes, it had great virtue signaling. We are going to give money to all these people. Great job. They are all poorer today than a year ago when you handed out \$1.9 trillion.

You start to look at who you are hurting. You start to look at folks in Social Security. Well, they are already upside down another percent.

You start to look at major healthcare programs. Well, the inflation there, packing into that.

You start to take a look at other mandatory spending. Well, at least that has actually been deflated upside down because they don't have the same COLA kickers.

But you start to add up what is going on, major changes and projected outlays. The budget process here is going to be really interesting coming next year when we take the majority because the mess that has to be cleaned up economically is not going to happen in a year.

For everyone who may be participating and crazy enough to listen to me, it is going to take years and years, maybe a decade, to just clean up this, functionally, 24-month cycle of what bad decisions did. For everyone listening, please, rethink your retirement.

□ 1900

Please rethink your savings. Please rethink your investments. You are poorer today than you understand because it multiplies out into the future, and I am scared.

I mean, we did one model in our office, and I have some boards here that are going to sort of touch on this, but let's see if I can try to describe it.

Let's go back to my retiree. You are on Medicare, okay. So there is a hold harmless on the cost of Medicare, but not your co-pay.

So if medical inflation is going up at almost double the inflation rate, so we had what, 8.6, but we have some charts that show medical inflation in the previous month may have been as high as 16, 16.8.

So if you have almost double, that 20 percent of cash that comes out of your pocket also just doubled. So you are going to get an 8 percent COLA on your Social Security, okay, and your Medicare premium will adjust some, but your co-pay is skyrocketing.

If you carry that out through the decade, the number of our brothers and sisters who will be in their retirement who will be in poverty—it is math. But, damn it, doesn't this place care about people, or is it just too painful to step up and say we screwed up? Well, they screwed up.

We are going to reach across the aisle. We are going to actually work with people who actually showed up to their economics classes. There are some ideas that would be good—and they should be bipartisan—that actually would help productivity, help people save for retirement, and would be great for bending the inflation curve.

Do you think any of us could get an amendment, actually even listened to? Because they don't care. It doesn't fit. Remember, we do public policy now by virtue signaling. The incredible difference—I am realizing the difference between my brothers and sisters on the left and those of us on the right is my constituents judge us on what did our policies accomplish?

I swear to you. The media and the left judge their folks on what was their intention? What were their feelings? Because if they were judged on what they have accomplished, they have accomplished misery.

As of May 2020, inflation is plateauing, really, rather than peaking. Understand what these economists were basically saying is this isn't transitory. We were promised that over and over and over from the Treasury Secretary, from the President, from Democratic leadership, even my brothers and sisters on the Democrat side on Ways and Means. Oh, it is temporary. It is a supply chain spike. No, it isn't. Such horrible policies.

They built a structural inflation problem. Now you are in a wage price spiral, and many of the economists are now saying it is not a peak and a fall—it is a plateau.

One of the things that scares the crap out of me—and I am sorry, but I don't know a better way to try without crossing the line and cursing and getting my words taken down—is you hit the inflationary cycle with stagflation, meaning you functionally have some economic growth. You have employment. The Federal Reserve is jacking up interest rates, so you are trying to push up some of the employment. You are going to see some unusual charts and data we have here.

But the inflation is sticky, and you basically have a plateau of inflation, you have a plateau of misery, and you are not able to raise it and crash it.

One of the reasons I come to you with that as a personal theory—and it drives some of my economists nuts on the Joint Economic Committee when I

say this—is I think we have a much more difficult demographic problem.

Inflation in the late 1970s, very, very early 1980s, you had this huge baby boom population that was available for labor, available with new technologies, investments to spike productivity.

We have got a demographic problem. Functionally, in 7 years, 22 percent of America is 65 and older. We have gotten old. We have huge, massive social entitlement promises that we have a moral obligation to keep—the financing of Social Security, the financing of Medicare.

Remember: Every new dime of debt over the next 30 years is just Social Security and Medicare. I know a lot of folks don't like to hear that, but it is. It is our demographic. We got old. The rest of the budget is functionally in balance.

Really hard to break a stagflation cycle without that available population spike to have that productivity to start to say, hey, we are going to make more stuff. We are cracking inflation.

When you start to see some of the smart economists saying hey, we have got a problem. We are plateauing. It is not a spike. This may be the mean for a while. What is amusing, in a very dark way, is I have used this chart once before, so it is the projection of where inflation was going to go.

The number of talking heads who would repeat the White House's line that oh, it is transitory, or it is just temporary, or it is Putin inflation. Come on. At some point, treat the American people like adults.

They may not have spent their life bathing in the numbers. They don't go home every night and read *The Economist* magazine and these things, trying to dig. That is our job. That is what we are paid to do. Other people need to take care of their families and have a life and try to survive these prices.

But the trend line on inflation is heading toward almost a 10 percent plateau. God, I don't think we are going to get there. I really don't, but that is my charting.

You know, this was our target. We are nowhere near our target. We blew through our target by 2.8 percent. I am trying to show the happy talk that was going on in the previous three or four months. Oh, inflation is transitory. They have been wrong.

I am going to do something slightly jerky. I have been here on the floor, and I got it right because we actually looked at the real numbers.

You know, when you looked at the April inflation and realize, well, damn it, April inflation, they were calculating—they had fuel prices, they had base energy going down .6, .4, based on the numbers. That isn't what happened in May.

I mean, all you had to do was break it apart and look at the numbers and own a calculator. But remember: We work in a math-free zone. You start to understand.

I know I am a Republican. I come behind the microphone, I sound like an accountant on steroids. That is not my point. These numbers are people. These numbers are hurting people. There are millions—matter of fact, almost all of America is poorer today than they were 15 months ago when the left took power. Judge us by that. It didn't need to be this way.

I mean, you know, what is it, Larry Summers—I mean, a leftist economist is begging the Democrats, saying, don't do this. Don't do it. Don't do it. You are going to hurt people. Oh, no. I am a Member of Congress. I understand better than a guy with a Ph.D. from Harvard.

Turns out the Ph.D. leftist from Harvard who was begging you not to do what you did; you went ahead and did it. Now you have a Republican quoting him on the floor.

Only large businesses—now, this one is important—are adding sufficient numbers of workers. So you remember how President Biden, I think it was yesterday, got behind the microphone and said, but we have such great employment.

The pessimism on small- and medium-size businesses has skyrocketed, and that is actually where much of our job creation and disruption in the economy and new spikes of productivity come from. They are the risk takers who will try new methods and systems.

So, right now, big business has still been doing the hiring. What happens is that function where the Federal Reserve goes about jacking up interest rates, they are going to crush mid-market and small businesses. I hope it doesn't come, but every number I look at says it is going to come: the recession the Democrats have brought us.

Is it going to continue the movement of the United States being a country of oligopolies, because we are going to wipe out a bunch of our small businesses? Our regional, smaller, mid-size businesses get wiped out, but the big boys stay because they can afford the regulatory—they can actually participate in capital markets.

Is that going to be the outcome once again, that this, once again, becomes more and more a monopolistic economy? You also know the problem with that is you don't get a productive society when you have massive players that control so much of the society, the economics.

Some of these numbers—you have got to understand, this number was the worst reading in 49 years for the smaller- and mid-size businesses doing hiring.

So you functionally have almost two economies running at the same time. But this economy here, the small and mid-size, are most of our employment. Be worried. These numbers are not warm and fuzzy.

Now we start to go to some of the cruelty that the Democrats' economics have done. You see that bottom line? Those are functionally real wages. So,

hey, here are inflation wages. Hey, I got a raise. Look, wages are going up. Real purchasing power. I am poorer today than I was the day before.

So when you hear leftists come behind these microphones and talk about income equality, they did it. It is driven by crap policy like this. This is what is going on right now. Real wages. People are getting poorer every single day.

Yet, there are folks here who are willing to just completely mislead on facts. Oh, but wages are up. Yeah, they are up. But they are not up nearly at the pace of inflation. This is really dangerous.

You have got to understand, if numbers like this continue, this is what tears apart societies. This is not a game. This is beyond me being a Republican, and I am beating up on Democrats.

Please. I know we are heading into election season. I know everything is about knifing each other, but this chart is actually—this line here is people. These are people getting poorer every single day.

We keep offering suggestions, and we can't even get an amendment considered. I understand the partisan cruelty to our side. We are not in charge. You are in charge. But why the cruelty to your own constituents?

Because this did not need to happen, and it doesn't need to continue. There are solutions, but maybe those solutions also require something very difficult.

You know, if you are in a 12-step program—and God knows I have had enough family in 12-step programs—what is the very first step? Admit you have a problem. Democrats, I challenge you. Take the first step. Admit you screwed up, you screwed the American people, and you are willing to make it right. You are willing to work with us who own calculators to make it right, to help our brothers and sisters not continue to be poorer every day.

These numbers should start to scare you. There are a number of economists out there I believe who have gotten this wrong. They say, well, we handed out so much free money in 2021, everyone had so much cash in their bank accounts, they set off inflation because everyone went out and bought a new television. Fine.

Okay. What happens by the end of 2021? By the end. So several months ago, credit card debt was climbing and had climbed rather substantially. That basically lets you know the way people were maintaining their consumption, their lifestyle.

It wasn't that they were building it in their earning power. They chewed up their savings. They were using debt to maintain their lifestyle. This is dangerous because at a certain point you hit that debt wall and you have how many of your brothers and sisters who, all of a sudden, now are in real financial stress.

□ 1915

When you start to see 28 percent annualized increase in the fourth quarter was the fastest on record, basically saying, hey, fourth quarter last year was the fastest on record of credit card accumulation of debt.

So when the White House, when my Democratic colleagues say, well, things aren't that bad. Yes, we have inflation, but look how good the economy is. You built an economy on fake money, and now people are borrowing it through their credit cards.

At the end of the fourth quarter, there was a sizable but shrinking pool of excess liquidity. So what they are basically saying is, do you remember how a number of us were coming to the mike and said, hey, Democrats, your \$1.9 trillion that you did, what was it, end of March 2021, you pumped all this liquidity into the marketplace, as you set off inflation. People shored up—they paid off some debt. They had lots of cash in their bank accounts, and it was substantially gone by the end of last year.

So how have people been financing the consumption of these incredible price hikes over the last few months? We are hunting for the latest borrowing data, but we are seeing some preliminary numbers. A lot of Americans now are in substantially more debt, so they are poorer than when the Democrats handed out \$1.9 trillion.

So within a year, they set off inflation, and they made people poor, and now they are upside-down in debt, and they have got to figure out a way to pay for it. It is like every economic nightmare. Everything you could do wrong has functionally been done in the 15 months of Democrat power.

Mr. Speaker Pro Tempore, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 28½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Look, this is functionally the same chart as the last one, except the point I am making on this one is we functionally moved from 1 trillion 726 billion up. Before that, we were at \$1.3 trillion of household savings. The savings basically has collapsed.

Is anyone talking about this? Remember, that was supposed to be the big Democrat talking point is, yes, we gave away a lot of money, but, look, we shored up people's bank accounts. It is gone. It is gone. And it wasn't done through productivity. It wasn't done through investments that lead us into a greater future.

The left keeps on saying, well, you invest in green energy. Fine. But that is not what you did. You basically adopted almost every policy—you do realize in the 15 months the Democrats have been in charge, we are burning a hell of a lot more coal today.

The 2021 number is 23 percent more coal was burnt to produce U.S. electrical energy because they blew up the natural gas markets. They made the

United States dirtier, according to the greenhouse gas calculations. So even on that they screwed it up.

And then here is sort of the punch line of why I am here tonight. You see the chart, you see the red, the red line? Is that red or maroon? Let's go with red. Do you see this chart right here? That is for folks under \$40,000 a year. And red basically means severe hardship. They are in economic stress.

This number here has exploded under the 15 months of Democrat control. This is what functionally they have caused by inflation, by everything around them. They have taken almost modest quartile of incomes, and they are brutalizing the poor. They are just brutalizing the working poor.

Now, those folks over \$100,000, yeah, but most of it is no real hardship. Their income category, they are doing not fine, but better. But you get down to \$40,000 and less. So if you ever let someone on the left tell you they are the ones who care about the poor and the working poor and the working middle class, they may care. They may care, but they brutalize them by their policies.

Look, it is in the math. Once again, the math doesn't lie. The math will set you free. But we seem to do policy by virtue signaling here, not by some of the most compassionate, which is do the right thing.

You have a model. Take a look what we accomplished in 2018, 2019, first quarter of 2020. The number of our brothers and sisters that were less poor, it was one of the most amazing economic revivals in U.S. history. Yes, we had the pandemic. Yes, it was miserable.

But think about this. Almost every bit of those gains are gone, and not gone because of the pandemic. They are gone because of the last 15 months of horrible economic policy that set off inflation, has set off optionality, has flatlined productivity, and actually really screwed up the next decade of our economic future.

These get a little more difficult to show, but basically you are trying to sort of demonstrate when we hit the Biden inauguration, so this is the moment where Democrats had absolute power here, and how quickly the financial cushion disappeared. Now, a lot of this disappeared because you have the occasion where we are going to hand you a bunch of cash, but we are also going to set off inflation. It turns out the inflation chews up the cash a lot faster than we are handing out free money.

As of April 2022, the average retirement benefits—now, this is going to make complete sense, and in the scale, the reality is much, much worse, but we are trying to do a calculation of if you are getting retirement benefits, how much are you losing? How much is it changing? Our first calculation was about \$162.

Now I need you to add a couple more months to that. What we are starting

to try to model is every month people on a fixed income, how much poorer are they getting. And that is also adjusting, say, they have COLAs, so they are going up, but the actual purchasing power, even adjusted with the COLA, they are falling, they are getting poorer every day.

Now we are finally starting to get some of the data. The problem is we are about 3 months behind on trying to do hard calculations.

Now you start to look, and this one is really important. I don't have a brilliant way to try to lay this out. When we look at different demographics and what they consume, a young family is going to have different consumption than a couple in their seventies. This one is going to be much more medical costs, and this one might be education and a new bicycle. So what happens when you start to realize that food energy, when you start to see it moving in the charts, but then you come down here and start to see medical services, where they are in the inflation graph, and then you try to adjust them to populations. Then you realize you are ending up with this crazy sort of bell curve of misery, where older Americans are getting crushed, and younger families are getting crushed because they don't have assets that are inflating. And this is what is going on.

I don't know why there is not a fire drill around here. I mean, what would it take for those of us as Republicans to basically turn to the Democrat majority and the White House and Speaker PELOSI and the left who is in charge here and say, we actually care about Americans. We are willing to work with you. Let's actually do the fire drill. Let's actually do the things that set off productivity. Let's fix expensing on the Tax Code. Let's do this, let's do that. What can we do instead of just letting the Federal Reserve jack up interest rates and put people out of work? And that way Democrats can blame the Federal Reserve and not their own policies because they need deniability.

Our job is to make people's lives freer, economically more stable, better, but also someone like myself—and, yes, I have a 6-year-old daughter, and my wife and I are the same age. It is the greatest thing that ever happened. Yes, I am an old dad. Greatest thing that has ever happened. What is my moral obligation to her future? Seriously.

For every person who on occasion actually shows up and works here, what is your moral obligation? What is your moral obligation to your parents and your grandparents but also to these kids? We already have this demographic curve that is going to make fixing inflation much more difficult, and we are basically shifting.

If you are functionally under 40 years old, and you are still voting for the left, please, please go to an economics class. Go buy a calculator. Understand the amount of misery that has been

shifted onto your future. My back-of-the-napkin math basically says for someone who basically is getting ready to graduate college today, when they hit their peak earning years, their tax rate will have to be double what today's is just to maintain today's benefits. Congratulations.

Look, Mr. Speaker Pro Tempore, I still have a number of charts, but basically they are all saying the same thing. You get to when the Democrats took power, and just what they did in blowing up affordability in our communities, blowing up affordability, productivity in the country, and it was Democrat policies because it is more than just what we voted on here.

It was basically threatening investors. It was threatening: The SEC is going to come and start to look at your investments. It is threatening. They used the regulatory state, they used the up and down, even the virtue signaling within businesses. I mean, how many businesses basically sold their souls so Democrats wouldn't say mean things about them?

You start to look at family economic insecurity, and it just has exploded again since the Democrats took power.

Mr. Speaker, and to whoever is interested, I am blessed to be the senior Republican for the Joint Economic Committee, so I have access to some very smart people, and we are just doing our best to try to understand the numbers but also what we can do with the numbers.

Last week I became the senior Republican for Social Security, and, you know, you are reading the actuary report, and then you are teaming it up with the actuary report for Medicare, and you start to realize the scale. The numbers here are stunning. The numbers of zeros.

And we will get the clown show around this place that says, well, if you fix waste and fraud; well, if you get rid of foreign aid; hey, if you just tax rich people some more, everything will be fine. None of those things are close to being true.

The scale of the problem that was already built into just our demographics and our promises, remember, the shortfall for Social Security and Medicare when you pile on our current debt is \$120 trillion, and that functionally hits in 29 years, and that is adjusted to today's dollars. Add in inflation, and the distortion.

So my last comment I really want to try to share is one of our projects we are working very hard in our office is if the Democrats' inflation continues for 24 months, how much of our society will be in poverty? How many seniors, how many younger people because of the distortion? They functionally have wiped out all the amazing economic progress we made in 2018 and 2019 and the first quarter of 2020.

Congratulations, you hated the last President, you hated the Republicans and what we did for the economy. Fine, you got rid of it. You wiped it all out.

□ 1930

But understand, in just 15 months, we have whole regions, whole populations, whole segments of our society that are several percent—sorry to put it in a percent—poorer today. It just doesn't go away, and you can't just do another transfer payment to make it up.

Turns out who you vote for does make a difference. Now, America gets to pay a price for what they did in the last couple of elections. But they were lied to. They basically thought virtue signaling was policy, and it wasn't. It was about winning elections.

At some point, Mr. Speaker pro tempore, the calculator tells the truth. Mr. Speaker pro tempore, at some point, we should be judged by our accomplishments for the American people. If that accomplishment is misery, be held to it. If it is prosperity, take joy in it. But we need to step up and demonstrate that we actually understand what is going on in our communities and that we are willing to step up and try to fix it instead of talk away from it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, for tonight's Special Order, the House Freedom Caucus would like to discuss our constitutional right to keep and bear arms.

I think it is really important that we make exceedingly clear that every one of the Members who is going to be here speaking this evening is as upset and disturbed by the tragic events in Uvalde as everyone else.

But what we will not do is allow the folks on the left side of the aisle to use that as a tool instead of addressing our school safety issues, instead of using it as a tool to address the mental health issues that are rampant across our Nation, instead to use it as a tool to diminish the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens across our country, not only reducing the rights but, additionally, putting them in jeopardy as well, at the same time that they continue to try to undermine law enforcement and compromise the law enforcement community to protect these very same individuals so that they are forced to go out and make sure that they can defend themselves and their families and their property.

This is a problem that we see taking place time and time again across our Nation. This isn't just happening in Seattle, in Portland, and in Minneapolis-St. Paul. Unfortunately, we are seeing some of these exact same leftist radicals who try to strip the power of law enforcement from cities even in the State of Montana.

No one would ever believe it, but we had ordinances that were proposed in Helena, Montana, in Bozeman, Montana, and in Missoula, Montana, to try to defund our law enforcement at the same time we see crime levels rising everywhere. They are violent crimes. I have talked to the attorney general, and he has verified that very information.

The Members who are going to be here tonight are going to talk about the Second Amendment, and they are going to talk about it in great detail because they understand, as the million Montanans do, that the Second Amendment is about much more than just hunting. As a matter of fact, yes, there are people who enjoy hunting with firearms, and they also enjoy just target shooting with firearms. They also have weapons that are antiques or family heirlooms that have been in their homes and families since the 1800s. The most important thing that the Second Amendment is about is home security, defending your home and your household, and that is what we are going to hear a lot about tonight.

I am proud to say that Montana ranks as the number one State with the most guns per household. That, my friends, is how we can keep those crime levels down. Sixty-four percent of Montanans' homes have a gun within them. Guess what? Criminals know that. When you put a sign out that says we defend our homes, people tend to stay away from those areas.

We have a lot of information to go over this evening, and I have several of my colleagues who are going to be here to help me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my dear friend.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Montana for yielding to me.

It is important for us to be here tonight. It is important for us to address the attack on the Second Amendment.

The reason I say that is that some people don't care about that Second Amendment. Some people would pack the Court to do away with that Second Amendment. That is an important right. It is so important that, in the Heller decision, Justice Scalia said: "The very text of the Second Amendment implicitly recognizes the preexistence of the right and declares only that it 'shall not be infringed.'"

What does it mean when you say that right is preexisting? It means that it is not given by the government, and thus it cannot be taken away by the government. Instead, it is inherent in every individual, every person.

In fact, the reason I use the word "individual" is because Justice Scalia made very clear, after a very lengthy discussion regarding militia versus individuals, that this is an individual right. It isn't some kind of collective. It isn't some kind of government-organized right. It is a God-given right, and

thus it is prohibited for government to infringe upon that right.

Justice Scalia went on to say exactly what I just said. He said: "This is not a right granted by the Constitution. Neither is it in any manner dependent upon that instrument for its existence. The Second Amendment declares that it shall not be infringed."

Anyone who has taken an oath of office to honor and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic, how can they then vote for legislation that would surrender that right to the government?

My friends across the aisle have failed to remember how important it is. I am going to make three quick points.

Number one: Why is an AR-15 important? It is a gun that is light and easy to handle for people who are being attacked. It is a perfect defensive weapon. It is important that we remember that.

Second thing: Good guys with guns actually do save lives. Democrats ignored the recent incident in West Virginia where a woman used her 9-millimeter pistol to stop a shooter who was shooting toward a crowd of people, with an AR-15, by the way. They ignored the actions of Stephen Willeford, who stopped a shooting in Sutherland Springs, Texas.

If you are relying solely on the police to come—I love my friends of the blue. We rely on them. We depend upon them. But when someone is attacking you, you don't always have time to wait for those first responders to get there.

My last point is this: If you are 18, 19, or 20 years old, you still have that God-given right to defend yourself and to the Second Amendment.

The proposals of this body ignore the fact that the Ninth Circuit recently recognized and realized that they have those rights, and they struck down a California law that imposed a restriction on 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds.

Ladies and gentlemen, those who are listening, don't give up your right. If you are a Member of Congress, don't take away this important God-given right.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROSENDALE for letting me speak.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much Representative BIGGS, one of our strongest defenders of the Second Amendment here in the body.

If the left wants to address this issue, let's be up-front about it. Let's be honest about it. Let's stop trying to undermine the Second Amendment through changes in statute. Let's stop trying to strip away people's rights by inserting something into a law that later would be struck down by the Supreme Court.

If you want to be honest and up-front about stripping away people's rights, then come to this floor, propose an amendment to the Constitution, debate it here on the floor, send it to the United States Senate, see if you can

get that done. Then send it back to the people of the United States and see how they feel about it.

That is how this is supposed to take place. You cannot violate the Constitution and strip away people's rights.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. BOEBERT), my good friend.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROSENDALE for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I love what Mr. BIGGS was saying, how these are our God-given rights. That right there is fundamental, and that is why we have a government, to secure our God-given rights.

None of our rights come from politicians. Our rights are not granted to us by the executive, by the legislative, or by the judicial branch. They are granted to us by God. These are our natural rights. They are unalienable. For anyone to say: "I am from the Federal Government, and I am here to help," well, those are very dangerous words.

Another thing that is dangerous is gun-free zones. I am a cosponsor of Congressman MASSIE's bill that would remove the law that makes our schools gun-free zones. That makes them soft targets. Our children are our Nation's most valuable assets. The more value an asset has, the more protection it should have.

We secure our banks. We secure our airports. We secure the White House. We have even seen the Capitol surrounded by fences, miles of razor wire on top of that fence, 26,000 armed National Guardsmen, because even my colleagues on the other side of the aisle understand that borders that are secure and armed security work.

We need to harden our schools. We need to secure our schools. I believe this starts at a very local level. Maybe there is something there that can be boosted by the Federal Government, some of this unspent COVID money to go toward boosting security in our schools.

We don't need to be inching away the rights and liberties of American citizens. Liberty lost never comes back. We don't get that liberty back that we give away. We certainly were not elected to legislate away liberty from our constituents. We are here to keep the American people free. That is the proper role of government.

A lot of people would like to say that the Second Amendment, well, it is great because we know you want to hunt. The Second Amendment has nothing to do with hunting. Our Founding Fathers did not just return from a hunting expedition when they created the Bill of Rights, when they drafted that. No, they had just got done liberating a nation from a tyrannical, oppressive King, and they wanted a government that was so strong and powerful that it would be able to fight off that tyranny and oppression that anyone from around the world might seek to reimpose on this people. But they also wanted a government so

limited that it would never impose that same tyranny and oppression on its own people.

Isn't it interesting that we heard for weeks how American taxpayers need to send money to Ukraine to make sure that those citizens are armed?

□ 1945

Now the same people who are saying that we were bought by Putin because we didn't want to send billions and billions of dollars to Ukraine while our southern border is insecure, while we have an invasion taking place at our southern border, when we have our own supply chain crisis, we have inflation that is skyrocketing, and we said maybe let's just put America first for a minute. But the same people who made these accusations against those of us who would vote against that spending are now seeking to take the rights away from American citizens.

And these same people who had no problem arming Ukraine and wanting to disarm American citizens also call to defund the police. We even saw 24 of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle just today vote to not provide added security to our Supreme Court Justices who have had mob violence at their homes, murder attempts against a Supreme Court Justice. And 24 of these radical leftists said: No, they are fine. We are not going to send police to protect you. You won't be able to protect yourself. It is all rogue.

This is a lawless administration that we are serving under, and I would implore the Senate to not compromise on the American citizens' rights.

And I would like to just note that the 10 that we have heard of who are considering siding with these people who would limit the liberties and freedoms of American citizens are either not coming back to the Senate, they are retiring, or they are not up for reelection. I think that that is very telling, and I will not give an inch on the Second Amendment, of the rights of the people to keep and bear arms to protect themselves, especially when cries from this Chamber are calling to defund law enforcement and our southern border is wide open, allowing the cartel to send whatever they want through those borders without any added security.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. ROSENDALE for leading this special order tonight, and I make reference that it is the House Freedom Caucus that is really setting the standard and protecting American liberties.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, we continue to hear the Democrats talk about the flawed arguments that we make that the Founding Fathers didn't know weaponry would advance the way that it has, that the Founding Fathers could not conceive of a government that would never force us to do something against our will or deny us of due process. Please consider some of the activities that have taken place and the mandates that have been placed

upon us over the last 2 years, and don't tell me that we have a government that has reached well beyond its boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), who knows what it means to fight for our country.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I don't think there could be a more serious matter before this body. Everyone in the country, frankly, everyone in the world knows we can't continue to see what is happening in our cities, in our schools, in vulnerable communities, we can't continue to see those things happening.

Sadly, Democrats have a preconceived play for every tragedy. A famous Democrat even coined the phrase, never let an emergency go to waste, never let a crisis go to waste.

It is a crisis for sure. But the crisis isn't the fact that America has guns or that individual American citizens have guns. We have always had guns.

What is different is the level of despair in our communities. We see it surging not just in mass shootings but in the rise of violent crimes, in the surge in suicides, in fatal overdoses. The leading cause of death for 18- to 45-year-olds is now fatal drug overdoses.

A lot of people will point to the mass shooters as they are ready to lose their lives. They have even coined a phrase, suicide by cop. They know how it is going to end when they go in doing it.

So what is driving this? Is it the gun? It is an inanimate object.

The solution, the Democrats say—it is a longstanding wish list. They have had a dream for a long time to repeal the Second Amendment. Frankly, they don't want to campaign on that.

Our colleague, Mr. MONDAIRE JONES from New York, when we were moving some of these bills through Judiciary Committee said, "You will not stop us from passing gun control. If the filibuster obstructs us, we will abolish it. If the Supreme Court objects, we will expand. We will not rest until we have taken weapons of war out of our communities." Frankly, Justin Trudeau agrees, but he is the Prime Minister of Canada. Canada doesn't have a Second Amendment.

Just today, I was walking through the Capitol from the Senate side to the House side, and a reporter stopped me, and she pointed out inaccurately that the Second Amendment grants us the right to keep and bear arms.

No, ma'am, the Second Amendment does not grant us anything. In fact, the Bill of Rights grants us nothing. The Second Amendment is a limitation on the ability of government to infringe on our preexisting rights. Just as the Declaration recognized we were endowed by our creator with certain inalienable rights that among them are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

This is an extension of the right to life. And, hopefully, tomorrow we will see the Supreme Court defend life. You can't defend freedom without defending

life. In the modern era one of the key instruments to defending life for adults is the right to keep and bear arms.

People have referred to some weapons as weapons of war. No, they are not the same weapons as weapons of war. Those were outlawed in the 1930s under the National Firearms Act. They have been outlawed for a long time. A semiautomatic rifle or a semiautomatic pistol is not a weapon of war, though sometimes they are used in that mode in combat. They are very effective in war, but our Founding Fathers didn't vest the defense of this Nation originally in a standing Army. In fact, they said we don't want a standing Army.

One of the limitations on this body is we have to fund the defense budget every cycle. We can't have it operate in perpetuity without reauthorizing it every time. We had a standing Navy, but we didn't have a standing Army.

Let's read the text of the Second Amendment. The Second Amendment says: "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." Famous words.

People want to pretend that somehow the Second Amendment granted the State the ability to keep and bear arms. Only if you are in the military. Only if you are in the militia. That is the same right to keep and bear arms the North Korean Army has. What a fallacy. I can't believe some of our countrymen fall for that, but some of them do. And that is why my colleagues repeat it. They know, though, but they say the lie anyway.

Well, what are we going to do about it? Well, we are certainly not going to surrender our freedoms because we know freedom surrendered is rarely reclaimed. We aim to keep our Second Amendment.

Just as Ben Franklin—recognized walking out of the Constitutional Convention—was asked: What have you wrought, sir? A Republic if you can keep it. The people, and we aim to keep it as the people's Representatives.

Who defends freedom in Congress? The Freedom Caucus. I am proud to be here with my colleagues taking this time tonight to defend this important freedom.

But I think people are right to say, So what are we going to actually do about it?

If you listen to the debate you might know that there are a lot of shooters that turn into active shooters, mass murderers, doers of evil deeds that people will say after the fact, well, you know, everybody kind of knew Johnny or whoever was crazy. You know, we kind of saw this coming. Maybe we could have stopped him. If only there was a red flag law.

So people in America might not realize that in every single State and in the District of Columbia it is already possible to stop such a person. The law is known as the Baker Act. It is possible to have a person, even involun-

tarily, against their will, adjudicated mentally incompetent. That law preserves due process. The person has a right to confront his or her accusers. That law locks up the right thing. You can't deprive a person—under the Fifth Amendment and the 14th, you cannot deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process.

Red flag laws reverse that. Not only do they get rid of the due process, it is essentially civil asset forfeiture. First, you seize the guns and you get to due process later. It seizes the wrong things. It locks up the guns.

The person is the dangerous thing. So you take the guns away from the person. The person, if they really are mentally dangerous, they can get access to guns in other ways, perhaps illegally, as a substantial portion of shooters do. Perhaps they could drive a car through a parade route. They could use a blade. They could use all kinds of ways to harm others, and frankly, they could also harm themselves, turning into one of the tragic suicides that occur every day in our country.

So, no, I think the Baker Act ought to be the thing that people focus on. Those are overwhelmingly State laws. And we have to focus on understanding why those laws aren't used.

My colleagues know of these laws, particularly the ones on the Judiciary Committee, but they don't bring them up. They pretend as if the only way to stop this is with the red flag laws. And you know, while I know the Democrats have had a longstanding desire to go after the Second Amendment, I will admit it is especially discouraging when Republicans break ranks on this core issue.

I was disappointed to see 10 of our House colleagues vote for some measure of gun control in the House. Five of them aren't running again, and five of them may find that they are not running again at some point. In the Senate there are already 10 that are openly supportive of this outline, framework of a deal. We haven't seen text, but we do know it encourages red flag laws, which ought to be ruled unconstitutional, as all civil asset forfeiture ought to be ruled unconstitutional.

When you look at civil asset forfeiture, it is disproportionately used in minority and disadvantaged communities.

Why? How? Because they don't have the money to get the assets back. The government seizes it. It spins due process on its head, and you have to go to court to prove the property is yours or that you are able to own it safely.

And when you talk about a gun, while guns aren't always cheap, lawyers are more expensive. So most people will simply buy another gun, rather than go back and fight the unjust action in courts. It is so ripe for abuse. It is horrible to see anyone who has sworn an oath to support and defend our Constitution support such measures. I hope people will pull back and rethink it; not rethink solving the problem.

Let's look at the Baker Act, and let's look at mental health. Let's look at these acts of despair that are wrecking our communities and individual lives, and let's stop falling for the fallacies that somehow gun control is going to end the actions of these doers of evil deeds.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for hosting this special order.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here with the members of the Freedom Caucus tonight because they are the ones that understand we are standing here with a simple task, and that is to defend the rights of the people across this Nation. That is what our job is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HICE), my good friend.

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Montana for your leadership on this issue and for all the members of the House Freedom Caucus who stand for the issues that are both constitutional and extremely important to the American citizens.

All of us, all of us, all of us have been shocked over and over to see the unspeakable acts of violence, mass shootings and the like that have taken place in recent years and are rising in intensity and frequency. We see the heart-wrenching situations that these tragedies create in families and communities, and we see the rippling effect that they have in our Nation as a whole.

But far too often when these types of things happen, the reaction has become predictable from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, from the media, from others who immediately jump to conclusions, politicize the tragedies, and transfer to an agenda that includes disarming law-abiding citizens and stripping away our constitutionally protected Second Amendment.

□ 2000

Stricter regulation is not the issue—it is not the answer. Stripping away constitutional rights of American citizens is not the answer to these problems.

When considering how to deal with issues like mass shootings, we need to dig down to the root cause. This is just common sense. We have a major problem, let's get to the cause of the problem.

Firearms are just a tool, and like with any tool, the tool is only as effective or ineffective as the one operating the tool. I am not a violent person, that is why I don't have violent guns. The guns are not the problem. The person is the problem.

If you have a violent person—as has already been stated tonight—a violent person is going to commit violent acts. What is our response here—let's not go after the person, let's not deal with the cause, let's go after the tool, the instrument that was used. That does not solve the problem.

If we are ever going to deal with issues like mass shootings, and a host

of other issues of that nature, then we have got to look at the problem, which is the shooter. We, in this country right now, we are a Nation in deep moral and spiritual crisis.

Among other things, we are watching our values in the family unit deteriorate right under our nose. Just today in a hearing in the Oversight Committee where the Democrats were yet again offering one piece of legislation after another that continues to deteriorate and dismantle the most critical unit in this country—that is the family unit.

Mr. Speaker, I would challenge anyone to take a deeper look at those who have committed such violent, heinous crimes that we have watched and see what their family life was like, what their spiritual life was like, and we will start finding some of the issues here that must be addressed.

Yet, we have so many attempts right now to address all the wrong things.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

BIDEN'S ECONOMICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss something that has been on my mind—discuss an issue that we have been talking about and we have been holding hearings in both the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, and that is the state of our economy, which I would characterize as the dire state of our economy, which I believe—I will demonstrate with some charts this evening—is due to the reckless budgetary policies of this administration.

What I am talking about is today we have inflation at 8.6 percent, which is the highest level in over 40 years. We also have a GDP, or gross domestic product, the total output of our economy that is shrinking in the first quarter. It shrank 1.4 percent. We may well be on the way to a recession if the second quarter shows that it is shrinking as well.

So there is no better time than right now to renew our Nation's commitment to fiscal responsibility, and to make a difference in the lives of the people that we represent.

Let's talk a little bit about inflation. Food prices are up 10.1 percent. Real wages—that is the difference between inflation and the rise of wages—are down 3.4 percent as of today, meaning that the average family is facing an effective pay cut of \$1,500 just this year.

Everyone knows gas prices are at their highest ever with average prices in my hometown of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, now exceeding \$5 a gallon. Overall energy costs, home fuel oil, and others included, is up 34.6 percent.

Unfortunately, as I will point out tonight, the spending policies enacted

and pushed by the Biden administration and by Democrats in Congress are really responsible for driving inflation and are certainly—even if you don't agree with that—they are certainly saddling future generations with debt. Someone will pay the price for the massive debt we have now, and unfortunately, that will be our kids and grandkids and future generations.

It has been said that Congress has a habit of only addressing problems when we reach a crisis—only addressing issues when we reach a crisis. That crisis may have already begun right now. We are in a pretty tough spot in our economy at the moment and people are feeling it every single day. We must step up to begin to address this.

Every Member of Congress, I am sure, has talked to their constituents and can share stories about how their constituents are impacted by rising prices. I can tell you myself, growing up as a child, I experienced what it was like to have it be difficult for my family to afford food.

I was one of 12 kids. My father was first a farmer and a roofer, my mom was a stay-at-home mom. I can tell you about a stressful time for my mother was going to the grocery store. The reason for that is because she knew she would not have quite enough money to buy everything that she thought she needed.

I remember walking with her up and down the aisles and she was calculating in her head how much she was putting in the cart. She was very concerned that she would get to the register and be embarrassed that she would have to put some things back. Today, people are feeling that.

I hear in my district, for instance, my constituent, Lamar, he put the impact of inflation in clear terms. He tells me that he spends more now but has less. He is doing with less. Paul says he is sadly giving up on his hopes of retirement at this time. Tim said he has to choose between gas and groceries every week. Lavern is 66 years old and had to go back to work to help out his children and his grandchildren now, though the impact of inflation on future debt will mean, as I mentioned earlier, that his grandchildren will be paying the cost of the reckless spending that we are seeing now. They will be paying for that for decades.

We have all heard from our constituents. We have heard their outcries. We have heard them talk to us about needing to rein in inflation. I think it is time that we take it as a wakeup call. Let's identify the causes of inflation and work to mitigate them.

That is one of the reasons that I wanted to get up and speak tonight because we have had debates in both of the committees that I mentioned about the causes of inflation—and that is not just a political debate—it is not just because. It is because the only way that we can begin to solve it is to understand the root cause of inflation, what led to where we are now, and then what we can do to change it.

It is going to take leadership at all levels of government to address not only inflation, but the \$30 trillion now in debt, and trillions of dollars in deficits as far as we can see and as far as the Biden budget projects.

I am a businessowner, not an economist, so I can't even say that I have all the answers. What I can tell you is that I believe that capitalism, freedom, and free enterprise have made the United States the most powerful Nation in the history of the world and has provided more opportunity than ever before in the history of humankind. I think returning to those core values can help lead us—will help lead us—out of this mess.

First of all, there is a chart I will show you. Inflation does not arrive randomly. There are forces that cause inflation. Every time we have seen inflation in our history there are forces that cause it.

In this case, we have had things that are outside of our control. Democrats will argue, and the President blames inflation on COVID-19, supply chain disruptions, Russia's invasion of Ukraine, the big bad oil and gas companies, and other things. I don't know what the next thing is that he will be blaming inflation on. I agree, they have certainly played a role in causing inflation.

However, those challenges are the same challenges that every other country across the world has faced and they do not explain why inflation in the United States spiked earlier and is much worse than what we are seeing in other countries.

This chart shows the annual core CPI inflation compared to OECD, which is sort of peer countries, the Organization for Economic Cooperation in Development Countries. It shows how inflation spiked starting roughly the beginning of 2021 and far exceeded that of a comparable country. What caused that?

I have another chart that puts a little finer point on this. This shows that inflation started about the time that Biden took office and really accelerated after the passing of the American Rescue Plan, which put trillions of dollars in spending into our economy.

Now, I showed that chart today in a hearing in the Budget Committee to Mr. Stephen Moore of the Save America Coalition, and he agreed that the clear difference between what we saw in the past chart, the blue line, and the other countries, the clear difference was the stimulus that was provided, the increase in demand that was provided by inserting trillions of dollars into the U.S. economy through the American Rescue Plan Act.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article I wrote, an op-ed that was published in *The Hill* on how President Biden's policies have caused and will further fuel inflation.

[From *The Hill*, Mar. 31, 2022]

BIDEN'S SPENDING PLAN WILL FURTHER FUEL INFLATION

(By Rep. Lloyd Smucker)

Americans are concerned about the economy. A recent NBC poll indicated that only 33 percent of Americans approve of President Joe Biden's handling of the economy. Inflation is now at a 40-year high and has families concerned about their financial well-being as they gather to review their budgets around the kitchen table.

Democrats try to dismiss inflation as a mere nuisance for Americans who have to cut back on so-called "luxuries." When my constituents point out that gas is too expensive, Democrats shrug and tell them to buy a Tesla. The Penn Wharton Budget Model concluded that inflation disproportionately impacts lower income Americans who have to pay an even higher percentage of their income on necessities like food and transportation. The latest consumer price index report shows prices for food are up 7.9 percent, gasoline prices recently reached record highs. We need to help the Americans who can't afford to put gas in their car, let alone buy an expensive new electric car.

Inflation isn't just an economic term; it has real world consequences for the constituents that I represent. In my district, I think of Connie who at 70 years old is looking for a part-time job to help make ends meet because of the higher cost of everyday necessities. I think of Tim who told me he must decide between buying gas or groceries. I think of Lynne who told me that she and her husband are planning to put off retiring because of higher prices.

These kinds of stories are commonplace as inflation strains family budgets across the nation. The Biden administration claimed inflation was "temporary" and now places blame on everything except his reckless spending. We know that the left's irresponsible spending has accelerated inflation past harmful levels. A study from the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco concludes that Biden's spending led to higher levels of inflation.

As the saying goes, an organization's budget is a statement of its values. Now that President Biden released his Fiscal Year 2023 budget, albeit seven weeks past the statutory deadline, we can see clearly that this administration puts wasteful, inflationary spending before all else. While the president preaches fiscal restraint, this budget puts forth policies reaffirming the president's tax-and-spend march towards socialism.

Biden's proposed budget would spend \$5.8 trillion next fiscal year. His proposal would continue to pile on to the national debt, which eclipsed \$30 trillion earlier this year. By their own estimates, his spending plan will add nearly \$15 trillion in new debt over the next decade, with annual budget deficits of at least \$1 trillion per year.

The Biden administration continues to live in an alternate reality when it comes to their inflation predictions. Their budget report estimated the consumer price index (CPI) would increase 4.7 percent for 2022. The most recent reading from the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that CPI is up 7.9 percent over the last year. In last year's budget, they predicted only a 2.1 percent change in CPI for 2022, far off the mark from the high levels of inflation that we're experiencing.

Buried deep within the administration's remarks in the "analytical perspectives" the Biden administration believes that inflation will return to its long-term trend in 2023 despite "considerable uncertainty" and their efforts to continue the White House's messaging blaming Russia for increased infla-

tion. They have spent nearly a year deflecting that their policies contribute to inflation, but at least the administration is no longer parroting that inflation is temporary.

From what we've read in Biden's first two budget proposals, Americans should remain concerned about his dangerous levels of spending, what it means for the future financial health of our nation, and what it means for the future of inflation levels. Our \$30 trillion national debt significantly impacts the next generation of Americans. Continuing to run trillion-dollar deficits and adding more to our mountainous debt further endangers our future.

While President Biden and congressional Democrats have tried to move on from their months-long public feud on spending, House Republicans are united in our fundamental principles of working to renew fiscal sanity in Washington through a limited government, pro-growth tax policy, and strengthening our free enterprise system to create opportunities for Americans to live the American Dream. We will exercise robust oversight of President Biden's spending spree to hold this administration accountable. We will continue to fight against wasteful spending ballooning our debt and deficit. House Republicans will work to put America's fiscal house in order.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, March 2021, the Biden administration and congressional Democrats rammed through \$1.9 trillion in deficit spending, and only a small portion of that really went to solving problems and helping people that needed help through the pandemic—that helped to defeat the pandemic. Much of this was not needed and only served to fuel inflation.

By the way, they were warned by many economic experts. We warned them. Republicans on the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee warned Democrats at the time this was passed in early 2021 that we would see exactly this result. We were relying on the forecasts of many economists who were saying exactly that, who were warning the administration of that at the time. Not just Republican economists, by the way.

There is a name that many of you will know, he is a former Obama and Clinton economist, Treasury Secretary Larry Summers, warned that the American Rescue Plan would be the biggest macroeconomic mistake in 40 years, and it would cause inflationary pressures of a kind that we have not seen in a generation.

Again, Larry Summers, a very well-respected Democrat administration economist warning that we would be seeing the inflation that we are seeing now, over a year ago, when the American Rescue Plan was passed.

Just recently a study by the San Francisco Federal Reserve confirms that prediction, attributing the American Rescue Plan for at least three points of the current 8.6 percent. Mark Goldwein of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, CRFB, described the American Rescue Plan as "pouring gasoline on the fire," in terms of an already stimulated economy.

In my discussion with CBO director, Phillip Swagel, during a House Budget

Committee hearing last month, he also agreed—head of CBO—that the American Rescue Plan Act pumped trillions of dollars into the economy that artificially fueled demand and ultimately drove today's inflation crisis.

□ 2015

So what happened?

We had far too much cash in the economy and far too much demand.

I will show you, Mr. Speaker, something that my Governor in Pennsylvania said. Governor Wolf tweeted that he wanted to send more money to people all across Pennsylvania after jobs were open and people were back to work because he said, "States are swimming with cash."

They have an unusual problem in Pennsylvania right now today. This is the week they are finishing the Pennsylvania budget, and they have more money than they know what to do with. Much of that came as a result of the American Rescue Plan, and it was excess money that wasn't needed in the economy.

So those funds would have been far better used paying down the deficit, paying down the debt, and not fueling inflation by artificially boosting demand. So it really is unfortunate because this hurts my constituents, and it hurts people all across the country that the White House did not heed the call of experts sooner and did not take steps to reduce the impact of inflation.

For a while the White House instead said that inflation would be transitory, and now just recently Secretary of the Treasury Yellen and Fed Chairman Jerome Powell backed off that argument and agreed that they were wrong, and that inflation was not transitory. We have a real problem dealing with inflation at this point.

Secretary Yellen said in a Ways and Means hearing just last week: "I think I was wrong then about the path that inflation could take."

One of the sad things about inflation is that it impacts different people differently. The White House has claimed that inflation and the economy's challenges that we are seeing today are high-class woes reserved for the rich. But instead, it is the people on the lower end of the economic scale who are making less money who are impacted more than any others by inflation.

The Penn Wharton Budget Model concluded that inflation disproportionately impacts lower-income Americans who have to pay an even higher percentage of their income on necessities like food and transportation, the price increases for which outpace the general inflation rate.

As I mentioned earlier, the White House tries to blame multiple sources: corporate greed, gas companies, Russia, and whatever else may be as a source of inflation. But I think that only serves to deflect blame, obscure the truth, and prevent us from coming to an agreement where we can then begin to solve this.

I think the President became more interested in inflation after seeing his plummeting approval rate. He is now talking about inflation being a top priority of the administration. In fact, just recently he wrote an op-ed in *The Wall Street Journal* titled: "My Plan for Fighting Inflation."

I will talk just briefly about that. He begins the op-ed by arguing that our economy is actually in great shape, which strikes me as being about as out of touch as you can get. He apparently isn't talking to the constituents whom I talk to on a regular basis.

He lays out three points for combating inflation.

One, well, it is the Fed's job; two, his energy policies and build back better agenda will fix it; and three, a supposed newfound commitment to fiscal discipline.

In the op-ed he said that he welcomes debate on his plan. And maybe tonight that is what we are doing. We are debating what really are the ways that we can combat inflation and whether his plan really will work.

So let's talk about the Fed because the President's first point was arguing that it is the Fed's responsibility to control inflation. And the President, again, has spent 1½ years pushing policies that fuel inflation and then points to the Fed to fix the problem.

Now, I do agree that the Fed has a role in controlling inflation, and essentially the tool they have will be to raise interest rates to try to slow down the economy. But we all know that raising rates will be required, which they are doing now. Tomorrow they are talking about a 0.75 percent increase in the Federal rate, which is a significant increase, and they are talking about doing that multiple times. So it has significant consequences on our economy both in the short and long term.

What do I mean by that?

It makes it more expensive for businesses to borrow money. It makes it more expensive for individuals to borrow money. We are seeing home mortgage rates go up significantly already that will continue to do that, and hundreds of thousands fewer people today are able to afford to buy a home when they could have done so when they were lower. So there will be a decrease for demand of goods and services which, again, is an attempt to tamp down the economy to decrease demand and decrease spending.

The other entity that is affected by rising interest rates is the Federal Government. We are \$30 trillion in debt. This chart shows what will happen as interest rates are being raised. By just raising one-half of a percent—you see the first line—will increase interest costs over the next 10 years by \$1.3 trillion. Going up 2 percent will increase interest costs by \$5.3 trillion over the next 10 years.

Now, let's put that in perspective. That would be, under the President's plan, 1.5 times our current Medicare spending, 1.4 times our current defense

spending, and 11 times our current veterans' healthcare spending. So every single dollar that we have to pay in additional interest costs will be taking dollars from programs that help people across the country and will be taking dollars out of our economy.

Increasing national debt is also a threat to our national security. Mr. Speaker, I also wrote an op-ed in May that was published in *The Washington Times*.

I include in the *RECORD* the article.

[From the *Washington Times*, May 17, 2022]

WHEN THE BALLOON POPS: INFLATING OUR DEBT AND UNDERMINING OUR SECURITY

(By Rep. Lloyd Smucker)

OPINION:

Twelve years ago, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chair Adm. Michael Mullen famously warned, "the most significant threat to our national security is our debt." At the time, the nation's federal debt was roughly \$13.5 trillion. Congress and our government have completely ignored Mr. Mullen's warning; our national debt has now surpassed \$30 trillion and is growing exponentially.

China now owns \$1.1 trillion of that debt, the second-highest total among foreign sovereign governments, a clear threat to our national security. If current trends continue, that number will increase to \$1.7 trillion over the next decade.

Mr. Mullen recognized the tangible risks rising deficits have on our nation. Every dollar spent servicing our debt, meaning dollars spent paying the interest on the debt already accrued, are dollars not spent on funding national priorities. Currently, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that we will pay an average of \$543 billion per year on just the interest for our nation's \$30 trillion-plus in national debt.

President Biden's Fiscal Year 2023 Budget only worsens the problem. Under the president's proposed spending plan, interest payments would jump to an average of \$756 billion per year, meaning \$2 trillion more in total interest payments over the next 10 years than currently projected.

Our country would be paying over \$1 trillion in interest payments to service the debt by 2031. To put that in perspective, by 2031, we would pay 1.5 times our current Medicare outlays and 1.4 times our current defense budget on interest payments. As Undersecretary of Defense Comptroller Michael McCord agreed during our discussion at the House Budget Committee, the increasing burden of mandatory interest payments threatens to crowd out discretionary spending priorities, such as our defense budget.

Mr. Mullen warned us that our debt would soon reach a point where we spent more paying off interest than funding our military, risking our national security. Under the president's budget, that warning will be proved true in 2029. Given that China owns an increasing amount of our debt, those interest payments will directly fund the interests of an economic, and perhaps military, adversary.

Unfortunately, rampant, irresponsible federal spending has compounding consequences on our economy.

Mr. Biden and House Democrats are wreaking havoc on our economy and fueling inflation. Spurred by the \$1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan Act, the inflationary impacts of which were forecasted and have been confirmed, our government ran a \$2.8 trillion deficit in 2021. The results of this massive spending influx by the federal government have been immediate and drastic: The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the

consumer price index for all items rose 8.3 percent over the past year, near the highest level in over 40 years.

Inflation not only harms our economy in the immediate future but also has long-term impacts on the cost of servicing our debt. In March, in an attempt to tamp down Mr. Biden's inflation, the Federal Reserve Board raised benchmark interest rates by 0.25 percentage points. On May 4, the Fed raised interest rates an additional 0.50 percentage points, the largest single increase since 2000. These rate hikes will have a ripple effect across our economy, including on servicing our national debt. As inflation persists this year, the Fed is expected to continue to raise rates at least 5 more times this year, with rates expected to surpass 1.9 percent.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, a nonpartisan nonprofit research organization, reports, "If interest rates are 50 basis points (0.50 percentage points) higher than projected, average annual interest costs would increase by \$94 billion per year." Even higher interest rate hikes will have even more devastating impacts. If interest rates were to exceed CBO's projections by 2 percentage points each year, similar to the Fed's expected actions for this year, our nation could spend an additional \$3.7 trillion servicing our debt over the next decade.

This does not even factor in expected spending increases under Mr. Biden's budget—this is just the impact of what has already been spent. My Republican colleagues on the House Budget Committee have prepared an analysis titled "The Consequences of Higher Interest Rates to the Federal Budget," which provides an even grimmer outlook on the long-term impacts of rate hikes on our nation's fiscal strength.

The Biden administration's spending increases the debt from the outset, and the Fed's response to control inflation by raising rates balloons the cost of our debt even more. Our national security will falter. America will be forced to fund China's rise. Generations yet to be born will be paying the price for Mr. Biden's inflation. It is long past time for Congress to step up and rein in this out-of-control spending and inflation.

Mr. SMUCKER. The article lays out how increased inflation ultimately undermines our national security.

China, perhaps our greatest adversary of the next decade, now owns \$1.1 trillion of the national debt. That is the second highest total among foreign sovereign governments, and increased dependence on China is a clear threat to our national security.

If the current trends continue, China's portion of our national debt will increase to \$1.7 trillion over the next decade. Interest payments as they rise will mean more income for China and will directly fuel China's growth making them a stronger economic and military adversary.

Twelve years ago, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Admiral Michael Mullen famously warned: "The most significant threat to our national security is our debt." That was 12 years ago. The most significant threat to our national security is our national debt.

At that time, by the way, the Nation's Federal debt was roughly \$13.5 trillion. Now it is at \$30 trillion and growing.

What could be even worse is if our lenders lose faith in the ability of the United States to pay back and make

good on those loans. If they essentially lose faith in the credit of the United States, that would be what we call a sovereign debt crisis which would have a major economic impact in the United States affecting every single American.

By the way, that is not merely a hypothetical. We have seen major nations face sovereign debt crises. In 2009 Greece's budget deficits totaled 12.7 percent of its GDP. By 2012, Greece's debt-to-GDP ratio was 160 percent. Under CRFB's analysis our debt held by the public will reach 126 percent of GDP by 2032 with the anticipated increased interest rates. If we don't change this trajectory, this will put us well on the way to a fiscal calamity like Greece has experienced not long ago, just a few years ago.

So it is long past time for the U.S. to get our fiscal house in order and abandon the reckless budgetary policies that sank the Greek economy at that time.

Let's talk just briefly about energy, Mr. Speaker, another big factor in the rising prices that we are seeing. This chart sort of blows me away. Average prices of gas in my hometown right now exceed \$5 a gallon. Think about that, Mr. Speaker. Just a year and a half ago, 2 years ago, no one would have imagined that we would be spending \$5 per gallon. You see the same kind of increases in home fuel, Mr. Speaker, heating costs, and so on. And the President blames oil and gas markets for that high inflation rate, and he focuses on the role of Russia in driving those.

But do you know what is amazing, Mr. Speaker?

Under President Trump when President Biden took office, our Nation was energy independent and becoming a net exporter of oil in 2019. Some of the very first actions that President Biden took were to halt drilling on Federal lands and to stop the Keystone pipeline. Even as prices went up, the administration doubled down on limiting the supply of our drilling. No new permits were approved. So it is a classic economic formula. They dramatically increased demand and reduced supply which led to the prices that we are seeing now.

The President just put out his new budget. He says that now—really the first time I think since he has been in office—it is important to reduce deficits. I welcome that. I think it is important that we reduce deficits. We have to reduce the debt long term. He claims credit for reducing the Federal deficit by \$1.7 trillion this year due to the expiration of spending in the American Rescue Plan which, by the way, is all deficit spending. He says that this reduction demonstrates a newfound commitment to fiscal discipline.

Now, let's just look at that for a little bit.

If I eat 10,000 calories today—which is way more than I need—and tomorrow I eat 5,000, well, that won't make me a model. It doesn't mean that I am on any kind of a diet.

Look at this plan. This is the President's budget straight from his budget documents. I get it. There was an anomaly during COVID. It was a challenge for all of us, and the deficit went way up during COVID. But look at the deficit before COVID which is the second bar on the left side.

And then coming out of COVID what happens?

Do you see—if you take out the two COVID years which was an exception, an anomaly, do you see deficits declining at all?

No. In fact, they are going up every single year.

That is not fiscal responsibility. In fact, I call it swamp math, to say that we are reducing deficits when this is exactly what it looks like in their budget plan. It is swamp math.

Mr. Speaker, if you set one foot outside the beltway, I can tell you that every single American who looks at this does not believe that we are reducing deficits in any way.

□ 2030

I don't mean that as a knock on the administration. Well, I guess I do mean it as a knock on the administration.

But what I really mean to say is that we have to get serious about implementing policies that will drive growth and that will result in lower deficits over time, or we will be going down that path of fiscal calamity.

Besides this, the other thing that the President is calling for, still calling for, is what he calls the Build Back Better plan. This is outlined in his budget.

Now, I call it build back bankrupt because it continues to put us on a path of a potential sovereign debt crisis. It certainly continues to build debt for our kids, our grandkids, and future generations.

The build back bankrupt plan imposes new taxes, 36 new taxes, on Americans and dramatically increases spending beyond what you see here. This is what they want to do, while they are claiming to do this, which they are saying is reducing deficits. It makes no sense whatsoever.

One of the other things I want to mention—I am running out of time here.

It has just been recently that we have had this economy working on all cylinders, and we could be doing that again. This economy could be in a far different position if we implemented policies similar to what were done under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act under the previous administration.

Just before COVID hit, we were seeing the impact. Almost every measure you could possibly take showed that the economy was working for the American people. By the way, middle-income American, the average household income increased by \$6,000 per year. That is a real impact. People were feeling it, compared to a \$3,500 drop in real wages during this administration.

The TCJA boosted workers' paychecks. Income and wealth inequality fell. Real wages for the bottom 10 percent, by the way, grew nearly twice as fast as the top 10 percent. Real wealth of the bottom 50 percent of households rose three times faster than that of the top 1 percent.

Despite the challenges that we face now, I think hope is not lost. I am optimistic that if we implement the right policies, America can once again work for the American people. We need to be committed to that. We need to have a discussion about what policies will work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3580—An act to amend title 46, United States Code, with respect to prohibited acts by ocean common carriers or marine terminal operators, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 15, 2022, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 117th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

CONNIE CONWAY, Twenty-Second District of California.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-4334. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Policy and Program Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of 9 CFR 355—Certified Products for Dogs, Cats, and Other Carnivora; Inspection, Certification, and Identification as to Class, Quality, Quantity, and Condition [Docket No.: FSIS-2020-0013] (RIN: 0583-AD83) received June 7, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4335. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Policy and Program Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Elimination of the Requirement To Defibrinate Livestock Blood Saved as an Edible Product [Docket No.: FSIS-2020-0005] (RIN: 0583-AD81) received June 7, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-4336. A letter from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's advisory opinion — Equal Credit Opportunity (Regulation B); Revocations or Unfavorable Changes to the Terms of Existing Credit Arrangements received June 9, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4337. A letter from the President and Chair, Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a transaction pursuant to section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-4338. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Annual Information Return/Reports (RIN: 1210-AB97) received June 8, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-4339. A letter from the Division Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — In the Matter of Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls [CG Docket No.: 17-59]; Call Authentication Trust Anchor [WC Docket No.: 17-97] received June 3, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4340. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's NUREG — Fuel Qualification for Advanced Reactors [NRC-2021-0112] received June 9, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-4341. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Department Report Number: 004769, pursuant to Public Law 116-260, div. K, title VII, Sec. 7070; (134 Stat. 1813) and Public Law 116-260, div. K, title VII, Sec. 7070; (134 Stat. 1813); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4342. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, De-

partment of State, transmitting Department Notification Number: DDTC 21-068; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-4343. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Diversion of Highway Revenues; Removal of Obsolete Regulation (RIN: 2125-AG04) received June 7, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-4344. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Senior Attorney Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Bridge Inspection Standards [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2017-0047] (RIN: 2125-AF55) received June 7, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 6933. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require reporting relating to certain cost-share requirements (Rept. 177-367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4140. A bill to make improvements with respect to the pricing of cattle in the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 117-368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas: Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. H.R. 3588. A bill to coordinate Federal research and development efforts focused on modernizing mathematics in STEM education through mathematical and statistical modeling, including data-driven and computational thinking, problem, project, and performance-based learning and assessment, interdisciplinary exploration, and career connections, and for other purposes (Rept. 177-369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. DEFazio):

H.R. 8049. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish the Aerospace Supply Chain Resiliency Task Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAPPAS (for himself, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. BEYER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CARSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEGUSE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. KUSTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MACE, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CLYDE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr.

VAN DREW, Mr. BOST, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. BUDD, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. TIFFANY, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. DUNN, and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 8050. A bill to reauthorize the Fallen Heroes Flag Act of 2016; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. EVANS, Ms. TLAIB, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CASTEN, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MFUME, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIEU, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. PORTER, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. BROWNLEY, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 8051. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an additional 1000 percent excise tax on the sale of large capacity ammunition feeding devices and semiautomatic assault weapons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 8052. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study on the global status of the civilian nuclear energy industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROW (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. BACON):

H.R. 8053. A bill to provide the Secretary of Energy with the authority to enter into contracts and cooperative agreements to improve the resilience of defense critical electric infrastructure and reduce the vulnerability of critical defense facilities to the disruption of the supply of electric energy to those facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. SOTO, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. POSEY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. BUCHANAN):

H.R. 8054. A bill to modify minimum required weight of orange juice soluble solids; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 8055. A bill to require State educational agencies to hire and train school resource officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Oversight and Reform, Financial Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN (for herself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. WALTZ):

H.R. 8056. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to assess technology

needs along the maritime border and develop a strategy for bridging such gaps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. JACOBS of California (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. BASS, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. SALAZAR, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 8057. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio (for himself, Mr. TURNER, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. ROSS):

H.R. 8058. A bill to require the Attorney General to propose a program for making treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder available to public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUGE (for himself, Mr. BURCHETT, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 8059. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out certain activities to improve recycling and composting programs in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington (for herself and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 8060. A bill to promote the creation of State anonymous school threat reporting programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. ROSS (for herself, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. RESCIENTHALER, and Ms. SALAZAR):

H.R. 8061. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to eliminate the statute of limitations for the filing of a civil claim for any person who, while a minor, was a victim of a violation of section 1589, 1590, 1591, 2241(c), 2242, 2243, 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2260, 2421, 2422, or 2423 of such title; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 8062. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code to prohibit picketing or parading certain buildings or residences; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 8063. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the private cause of action for damages in the case of a primary plan which fails to provide for primary payment or appropriate reimbursement; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself and Mr. FLEISCHMANN):

H.R. 8064. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish demonstration and pilot projects to facilitate education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mr. SOTO, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. SWALWELL, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 8065. A bill to authorize the development of a national strategy for the research and development of distributed ledger technologies and their applications, to authorize awards to support research on distributed ledger technologies and their applications, and to authorize an applied research project on distributed ledger technologies in commerce; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 8066. A bill to make technical changes clarifying section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 8067. A bill to make technical changes clarifying section 503 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H. Res. 1173. A resolution electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mrs. AXNE):

H. Res. 1174. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Deep Vein Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. GUEST, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. RUTHERFORD):

H. Res. 1175. A resolution supporting the designation of June 26, 2022 as the "International Day against Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 8049.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PAPPAS:

H.R. 8050.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution states that "Congress shall have the authority to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 8051.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 8052.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of article I of the U.S. Constitution provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce.

By Mr. CROW:

H.R. 8053.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART:

H.R. 8054.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. GARCIA of California:

H.R. 8055.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN:

H.R. 8056.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution

“All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.”

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

Congress shall have the power . . . “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”

By Ms. JACOBS of California:

H.R. 8057.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. JOYCE of Ohio:

H.R. 8058.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 8059.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. RODGERS of Washington:

H.R. 8060.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. ROSS:

H.R. 8061.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROUZER:

H.R. 8062.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, VII

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 8063.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 8064.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 8065.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 8066.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1; Article I, Section 8, clause 18; and Article I, Section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 8067.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1; Article I, Section 8, clause 18; and Article I, Section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 72: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 251: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 336: Ms. SHERRILL.
H.R. 541: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 608: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 622: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 623: Ms. BROWNLEY and Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 645: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 911: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 1007: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 1026: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1164: Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1207: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 1297: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1330: Mr. STEUBE.
H.R. 1417: Mr. JACOBS of New York.
H.R. 1560: Ms. MATSUI and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 1567: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. TIMMONS, and Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 1607: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 1627: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LIEU, Ms. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1646: Mr. DONALDS.
H.R. 1729: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 1946: Mr. GARCIA of California and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1948: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 2037: Mr. KILMER and Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 2196: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2252: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 2255: Mr. CORREA.
H.R. 2294: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 2337: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 2451: Ms. SALAZAR.
H.R. 2489: Mr. MCEACHIN.
H.R. 2706: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2717: Mr. VAN DREW.
H.R. 2820: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 2907: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2974: Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BUDD, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MANNING, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. OWENS, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3159: Mrs. LAWRENCE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3183: Mr. WITTMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 3294: Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 3425: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. BUDD.
H.R. 3483: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 3498: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 3558: Ms. ROSS and Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 3895: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 4118: Ms. TLAIB and Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 4151: Ms. JACOBS of California.
H.R. 4176: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 4239: Mrs. FISCHBACH.
H.R. 4268: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H.R. 4287: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 4311: Ms. SPEIER.
H.R. 4366: Mr. MALINOWSKI.
H.R. 4390: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 4436: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 4457: Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. SOTO, and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 4603: Ms. PORTER, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 4607: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4636: Mr. CLEAVER and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4780: Ms. STANSBURY and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 4826: Ms. ROSS.

H.R. 4841: Mr. MRVAN.

H.R. 4865: Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 4919: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 5041: Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 5218: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 5370: Ms. SEWELL and Ms. BOURDEAUX.

H.R. 5605: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 5632: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 5893: Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 5987: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 6037: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 6134: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 6190: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 6192: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 6202: Ms. PORTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. DEAN, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 6251: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CASE, and Mr. MALINOWSKI.

H.R. 6319: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 6336: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 6398: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 6411: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 6538: Mr. LIEU and Ms. LETLOW.

H.R. 6567: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 6571: Ms. VAN DUYN.

H.R. 6583: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 6613: Mr. McNERNEY and Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 6629: Mr. CASE and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 6635: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 6658: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 6702: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 6712: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS.

H.R. 6716: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 6768: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 6785: Ms. BARRAGÁN and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 6937: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 6940: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 6991: Ms. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 7033: Mr. DONALDS.

H.R. 7048: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BACON, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 7122: Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H.R. 7151: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 7167: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 7249: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 7294: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 7395: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 7438: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 7439: Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. STANSBURY, and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 7451: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 7462: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 7477: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. FITZGERALD.

H.R. 7534: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 7559: Ms. DEAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. WOMACK, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 7624: Mr. RUSH and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 7642: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 7644: Mr. SOTO and Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 7647: Mr. POCAN, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 7651: Mr. BURCHETT.

H.R. 7693: Mr. OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 7705: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. BENTZ, and Mrs. FISCHBACH.

H.R. 7729: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 7731: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 7768: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 7814: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. STEVENS, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. NEGUSE.

- H.R. 7824: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 7837: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. JACOBS of New York, and Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 7847: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 7851: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 7884: Mr. ROSE.
H.R. 7892: Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 7896: Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. PERRY.
H.R. 7902: Mr. CARL.
H.R. 7912: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 7935: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 7942: Ms. LETLOW, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. LATTA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BENTZ, Ms. SALAZAR, and Mr. DUNN.
H.R. 7946: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RUSH, and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 7949: Mr. SOTO, Ms. BUSH, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 7951: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 7966: Mr. TIMMONS.
H.R. 7987: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 8004: Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mr. PENCE.
H.R. 8048: Ms. MACE.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.J. Res. 80: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 734: Mr. SOTO.
H. Res. 913: Mr. MOONEY.
H. Res. 946: Mr. MOONEY and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H. Res. 975: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. STANSBURY, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H. Res. 1076: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H. Res. 1083: Mr. CROW, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 1091: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H. Res. 1102: Mr. MOONEY.
H. Res. 1155: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. TLAIB, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
H. Res. 1166: Mr. WEBER of Texas.